The presentation of Imperial authority : problems of continuity in the mid-third century AD.

Watson, Alaric

THE REPRESENTATION OF IMPERIAL AUTHORITY:

PROBLEMS OF CONTINUITY IN THE MID-THIRD CENTURY AD

by ALARIC WATSON

Submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

King's College, University of London

1992.

ABSTRACT

To understand the political developments of the third century we need to re-examine the relationship between usurpation and legitimation. The conventional notion of legitimacy turns upon recognition by the senate. On this basis the old Principate/Dominate dichotomy (which, though rarely explicit, still persists) places a radical break in the ideological structure of political authority in the empire during the third century; but to accommodate the anomalous reign of Postumus within this scheme requires a separatist interpretation. By surveying the titles, insignia and other verbal and iconographic imagery on the coins and inscriptions for the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, the so-called "Gallic emperors" and Aurelian, I find no grounds for "Gallic separatism". Instead what emerges is a greater insight into the process of legitimation of imperial authority, of which the formal legal ratification by the senate formed merely one aspect. Whereas the symbolic representations surveyed are usually dismissed as mere trappings, they are in fact integral to the mechanics of authority. The survey reveals that the symbolism is rooted in a profound sense of continuity with the past. Above all, the emperor is represented as a restorer and refounder, the reincarnation of the father of

the Roman empire: Augustus is the paradigm to which the symbolic representation of imperial authority in the third century looks back. Augustus was an individual who gained political authority through military strength; usurpation thus became a built-in feature of the empire. Galba had revealed the first _imperii arcanum_. Postumus merely revealed another: as the political significance of Rome, and its senate, waned with the emperors' prolonged absences from the city, it was possible for an emperor to _maintain_ his authority without being in Rome, or even being recognized there. This provides a vital clue to understanding the true continuities in the political development of the Roman empire.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Tables in the text:

Tables in the appendix:

CHAPTER 1

APPROACHING THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE MID-THIRD CENTURY

1.a The Historical Reputation of the Mid-Third Century

1) The Roman "Dark Age"

During the mid-third century the Roman empire was beset with troubles, of which one of the most salient and most significant was the insecurity in the tenure of imperial power. Rostovtzeff's characterization of this period of almost incessant coups, insurrections and civil wars as a "Military Anarchy", though tendentious, is not without some foundation. Hobbes' famous description of anarchy as "continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish and short" is an overstatement applied to the third century situation as a whole; but with respect to the plethora of ephemeral would-be emperors who arose during that period it would seem to be singularly apposite. As Gibbon put it:[1]

> Such was the unhappy condition of the Roman emperors, that, whatever might be their conduct, their fate was commonly the same...almost every reign is closed by the same disgusting repetition of treason and murder.

In the half century from the assassination of Severus Alexander to that of Carinus, that is from AD 235 to 285, some sixty or so individuals were hailed as emperor in various parts of the Roman empire. With scarcely any exceptions, these individuals both assumed and forfeited their claims as a direct or at least an indirect result of war, rebellion or assassination.[2] This political turmoil, in which civil wars, at times involving a de facto division of the empire, were recurring at a pace not seen since the last decades of the republic, must be set against the other troubles and vicissitudes of the period. The external military threat was mounting, with barbarian incursions penetrating deeper and more frequently into Roman territory than at any time since the end of the Second Punic War. Fiscal policy apparently drifted out of control, to the point where galloping inflation and the outrageous debasement of the currency all but undermined the economy. According to convention, all these ills, collectively labelled "the crisis of the third century", brought the political, military and economic infrastructure of the state perilously close to collapse in the decade or two following the capture of Valerian by the Persians in 260.[3]

Making sense of the political tangle of the mid-third century AD has proved an enduring problem for historians of the Roman empire from late antiquity to the present. To a great extent this is due to the comparative lack of reliable information for the period. Of the contemporary

literary accounts from this period, notably the works of Dexippus, only the smallest fragments survive. The subsequent literary evidence is notoriously meagre both in detail and reliability. Even though the excesses of misrepresentation in the Historia Augusta have perhaps been overstated by some modern scholars, the evidence scarcely inspires confidence.[4] Other kinds of evidence for this same period are also disappointingly uninformative: there is an appreciable drop in the amount of surviving legal texts and other such non-literary evidence; the epigraphic evidence is also well below that pertaining to the periods before and after; and although the archaeological and numismatic evidence is relatively plentiful, it remains difficult to organize and interpret in view of the paucity of other evidence.[5]

The mid-third century was thus not only a period of dire political, military and economic insecurity, but also one of the least well documented periods of Roman history. The convergence of these two factors is, of course, not merely coincidental. The insecurities of the period were conducive to neither the creation nor the survival of documentation. On the other hand, this very lack of evidence has, over the centuries, helped to promote the notion of "crisis" in order to help account for the lack. A.H.M. Jones perhaps best summed up the difficulties facing ancient historians in this regard with his graphic description of the mid-third century as a "tunnel": a period of almost impenetrable gloom separating two periods

that are comparatively well lit. The effect of this "tunnel" has been to foreshorten the third century, and encourage the tendency to pass over with relatively little comment the half century that intervenes between the two areas of comparative illumination at either end.[6]

In this way, the mid-third century has earned a reputation as something of a Roman "Dark Age" in every sense of the term. I want in this thesis, among other things, to consider not only the validity but also the impact of this reputation, for the underlying assumption is in itself an important issue with which any serious inquiry into the political developments of the third century must come to terms.

ii) The third-century caesura

The problematic historical tunnel has not merely affected the historiography of the mid-third century. The history of the whole Roman empire has traditionally been divided into two phases, with a more or less complete break towards the end of the third century. The justification for placing this caesura after the mid-third century has been that there is perceived to have been a <u>constitutional</u> change in the nature and basis of imperial authority at that date. The key determinant in this clear-cut periodization is the question of legitimacy. Before the mid-third century, the "legitimacy" of an emperor is seen to depend upon his ratification by the

senate at Rome; after that time, this "constitutional right" no longer lay with the senate, and the emperor's power is seen as absolute and despotic. This notion of constitutional change is reflected in the traditional terminology applied to the two phases: "Principate" and "Dominate". This terminology, at one time almost ubiquitous, is revealing since it necessarily has overtones of moral censure carried over from the Latin terminology from which it derives. According to the conventional wisdom, the onslaught of the political "crisis" in the mid-third century was responsible for bringing about this massive change in the nature of the regime itself. This decisive transformation has sometimes been portrayed as remarkably precipitous: in an extreme version of this view, written in 1919, Otto Schulz was able to affirm with uncanny precision that the "Principate" gave way to the "Dominate" in the autumn of AD 282. The sole ground which Schulz offered for this assertion was his contention that Carus had dispensed with the formality of the senate's confirmation upon his accession.[7]

In recent decades it has begun to seem increasingly out of date to consider the history of the Roman empire in terms of a "Principate" and a "Dominate". It is no longer acceptable to dismiss the mid-third century as a mere "anarchy" and we are beginning to question more closely the effects of individual elements within the "crisis" without exaggerating their intensity. In the present

climate of opinion, in which cultural relativism is the orthodoxy, it has become easier for scholars to take a more objective assessment of the available information. Many historians working in the field have come to recognize the constraints of the conventional model, and have actively sought ways of making better use of what meagre evidence does survive from the mid-third century in order to try to elucidate the extraordinary events that took place in the "tunnel". To this end, they have turned increasing attention upon the evidence furnished by archaeology, epigraphy, papyrology, numismatics and comparative sociology.

While new approaches have thus opened up, I fear that these have all too often addressed the details rather than the larger issues and that the changes in our underlying assumptions have been rather more cosmetic than is usually appreciated. In effect, the heart of the matter, the notional caesura itself, still persists and with it the notion of a fundamental and fairly abrupt constitutional breakdown in the mid-third century. In such a climate of opinion it has been all too easy to overlook what significant elements of continuity there may be within the structures of imperial authority running through the mid-third century. The strength of the notional caesura and the manner in which the assumptions that underlie it have evolved and persisted over time are important issues I wish to re-examine.

1.b Usurpation and Legitimacy in the Third Century

1) The conventional dichotomy of legitimacy

The mid-third century, during which emperors were created and dispatched with almost monotonous regularity, provides us with a unique opportunity to study imperial authority at a critical and therefore a potentially revealing moment in its history. The key to understanding the functioning of imperial authority during these "crisis" years seems to me to lie in the relationship between usurpation and legitimacy. On the whole, historians have tended to regard these two concepts as essentially antithetical. For the sake of bringing a semblance of order to the apparent political chaos of the mid-third century, the plethora of imperial contenders are almost invariably separated into two distinct categories: "legitimate emperors" and "usurpers" (or, in terminology borrowed from the late Roman literature, "tyrants"). This dichotomy, which formed the basis of Mommsen's Kaiserliste, has been accepted by most scholars working in the field, and usually without comment. The simplicity of this approach is attractive; but is it justified?

The notion of "legitimacy" on which the conventional dichotomy of third-century imperial claimants is based turns upon the same single criterion which is held to determine legitimacy in the first two centuries of the

empire; that is, the recognition and legal endorsement of the contender by the senate at Rome. In the mid-third century the brevity of many of the reigns, the varied success with which contenders were able to establish their authority and the scarcity of reliable information have contributed to confusions over exactly which contenders should be regarded as legitimate; but on the whole, in spite of a few minor variations, there is broad agreement.

The treatment of the legitimacy issue by Jones in his work The Later Roman Empire (a modern classic in its field) is typical. Having, in his choice of subject matter, accepted the notion of a mid-third century caesura, Jones proceeds to discuss the "crisis" in terms of the conventional dichotomy as if it were a given that required no comment.[8]

> In the fifty years between the death of Severus Alexander and the accession of Diocletian there were about twenty emperors who may be styled legitimate, without counting the nominal co-regents that some of them created, still less the host of usurpers who from time to time ruled parts of the empire, usually for brief periods, but sometimes like Postumus in Gaul for almost a decade. Postumus' nine years are in fact a record, the longest legitimate reigns being the seven years of Valerian and the eight of his son Gallienus: the average, counting legitimate emperors only, is about two years and six months.

Although in many other ways Jones' work now seems rather old-fashioned, with regard to this essential dichotomy, however, very little has changed in the quarter century since it was written. In the course of this thesis I wish to determine how far the evidence supports such an axiomatic contrast between emperors "who may be styled

legitimate" and the "host of usurpers", and how far is it in fact an artificial distinction which takes insufficient account of one of the most salient political features of the period: namely, that all these would-be emperors came to power through the use of force?

ii) Usurpation, legitimacy and secession

The issue of the almost constant use of force as a means of attaining imperial power raises some other complex questions concerning the nature of usurpation and legitimacy and how we should define such concepts which I should like to address. These can be summarized by the somewhat rhetorical question, when is a usurper not a usurper? Does the almost incessant run of usurpations and civil wars in the mid-third century in practice mean that legitimacy was never quite attainable, even given the frequent senatorial endorsements? In other words, how valid was senatorial recognition received under duress? Should the conventional dichotomy of legitimacy based on senatorial recognition be modified to exclude the seemingly rough breed of army generals who in fact rose to power through these constant military coups altogether? Jochen Bleicken has, in effect, proposed that we preserve the conventional dichotomy on a theoretical level by declaring the category of "legitimate emperor" to be empty on the grounds that none of the contenders of this period <u>deserved</u> senatorial recognition.[9] Does this approach

significantly advance our understanding of the political development of the mid-third century?

Looking at the problem from the opposite angle, what is the relationship between "legitimacy" and "success" with regard to an individual's claim to power? Lopuszanski remarked of the imperial pretender: "C'est la réussite seule qui décide au troisième siècle s'il sera reconnu comme empereur légitime ou flétri comme 'tyran'."[10] The "réussite" he had in mind was the gaining of senatorial recognition; but can we appreciate the complexity of the relationship between usurpation and legitimation in this period better by defining "success" in a more straightforward sense? For instance, Postumus retained the allegiance of most of the western part of the empire, from Spain through Gaul and the Germanies to Britain, for a period of nine years. During this time he was able to overcome more than one attempt to remove him through civil war as well as to prosecute several successful campaigns in defence of the Rhine frontier.[11] In third-century terms this was success indeed. Is it meaningful, in spite of his evident success, to relegate Postumus to the "host of usurpers"? Moreover, to a lesser degree, the same relative success is evident for several other contenders who have been classed in this way. Among these are Victorinus and Tetricus, each of whom successively inherited Postumus' position in the western provinces, though in a somewhat reduced area, and held it for two years or more.[12] Similarly, the brothers Macrianus and

Quietus held the allegiance of much of the eastern part of the empire for over a year.[13] Even the modest successes of these claimants, let alone the achievements of Postumus, are in marked contrast to the pitiful attempts by certain so-called "legitimate emperors" to assert and maintain their authority.

These points raise another issue that is germane to our line of questioning here. Were Postumus and his successors in Gaul claiming the same Roman imperial authority, and in the same fashion, as their rivals elsewhere such as Macrianus, Quintillus or Aurelian? Or should the entire sequence of emperors who were recognized in the western provinces in the years 260-74 be treated as a case apart? If we assume, as many scholars have done, that the aim of these emperors was secession rather than simply usurpation; if we regard them as attempting to set up a new political entity, quite distinct from the Roman empire as such (in the succinct German terminology, that they were Sonderkaiser rather than Gegenkaiser); that is to say, if we assume that the authority these emperors were claiming was distinct from that of a Roman emperor, then they can be placed altogether outside the "legitimate emperor"/"usurper" debate. This contention may be termed "Gallic separatism".

In this thesis I shall therefore pay special attention to Postumus and his successors and to the problems of "Gallicism" and "separatism" in the western provinces.

Once we have established the relationship between the reigns of these emperors ruling in Gaul and the cycle of usurpation and legitimation in the empire as a whole during this period, we shall be better placed to ascertain the true nature of the political development of the mid-third century and to assess the role of legal ratification within this development.

The traditional appellation "Gallic Empire", although sanctioned by usage, is problematic in that it appears to prejudice the outcome of this investigation. Certain recently suggested alternatives, such as "Gallic usurpers" or "Romano-Gallic empire", while addressing some of the difficulties involved in the traditional terminology, still remain potentially misleading, not least in their retention of a specifically "Gallic" identity.[14] So as to avoid this complication, I propose to use the neutral terminology "western emperors". The term must be understood as purely descriptive, referring to a group of self-styled emperors whose authority was recognized for a time in parts of the western provinces; it does not imply any geographical restriction on their claim to political power, any more than does the equivalent term of "central emperors", which I shall use to describe the succession of equally ephemeral emperors who were recognized at Rome during these same years. We should, for now, avoid the suggestion that any of these emperors ruled over a limited political entity referred to as the "western" or the

"central" empire, since this implies more than a de facto division of loyalties within a single empire.[15]

1.c Representations of Imperial Authority: Verbal and Iconographic Imagery as Aspects of Legitimation

The complexities of the situation in the mid-third century require that we consider a broader range of subject matter than can be covered by the constitutionalist sense of the terms "legitimacy" and "usurpation". We must pass beyond constitutionalism, with its insistence on the primacy of recognition by the Roman senate, to the very nature of political power itself. To this end, we must consider every aspect of the process of legitimation whereby power acquired by force of arms was translated into accepted authority.

The opening move in the bid for supreme power by almost all of the imperial contenders of the mid-third century was military acclamation. This ritualized action, whether orchestrated or spontaneous, associated the contender with certain verbal and visual symbols of "imperial" authority, such as the title <u>imperator</u> itself and the wearing of a purple cloak.[16] But the effective impact of these symbolic gestures was limited to the arena in which they occurred. The would-be emperor had to find ways of promulgating his authority that would be both instantly

recognizable and effective beyond the military camp or city where his bid for imperial power was initiated and indeed beyond wherever he happened to be in person at any one time.

Throughout the ancient Mediterranean world (and in most cultural systems, including our own) social or political status was partly conveyed by means of portraits and inscriptions on public display. An individual's particular status was conveyed both by the iconography of the image or the wording of the inscription and by the context in which the object associating the individual with such visual and verbal imagery was erected.[17] Certain symbols of this kind were recognized as conveying imperial status, and the representation of an individual employing such symbolism was generally understood, at least on the intuitive level, as a representation of his imperial authority. It was therefore the association of an individual with ~~the~~ these particular details of iconography, wording (especially titulature) and context that identified him as the emperor and singled him out from the crowd of lesser dignitaries whose portraits and inscriptions filled the public spaces of the ancient world.

There were in fact a number of media through which an emperor's authority could thus be symbolically represented to and perceived by his subjects. Among them, sculpture and inscriptions were not especially quick or cheap to

produce or distribute and, once set up, were for the most part tied to a fixed location. These disadvantages did not apply to the most important and most extensive medium, the context and content of which associated the individual represented with imperial authority: the imperial coinage. Coins were mass-produced from dies; they travelled faster than centrally distributed portraits; through their use as currency, they were effectively self-distributing and continued to circulate freely. The coinage was thus a particularly efficient means of conveying an individual's imperial authority to the widest possible public.[18]

The design of the coin was not merely external or aesthetic, but actually formed part of its functional definition. It is crucial to recognize, in this respect, that the range and depth of symbolism used on Roman imperial coinage far exceeded anything comparable today.[19] The representation of the emperor's authority was necessary to validate ("authorize") the flan as genuine ("authoritative") currency. At the same time, the acceptance of the coin as genuine currency was, by implication, an acceptance of the authority of the emperor in whose name it was issued. This association was, for instance, fully appreciated by Jesus and his audience when he made his famous reply to the pharisees: "Whose is this image and superscription?... Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." (I shall return to this complex matter in more detail later.)[20]

In asserting that some individual or other made a serious claim to wield imperial authority in the mid-third century, the Historia Augusta cites as proof the "fact" that the imperial contender in question issued coinage. Although historians today cannot afford to trust such testimony on the basis of this source alone, the connection between an individual's claim to Roman imperial authority and the existence of such coins is readily and universally accepted. Indeed the same connection is applied to inscriptions and papyri which juxtapose an individual's name and imperial titulature.[21]

The bare fact that portraits, inscriptions and coins, through their use of certain verbal and iconographic imagery, suggest that a particular individual was emperor is but one aspect of the potential significance of the symbolism expressed in these various media. The precise form of the symbols used, their interrelation and history and where the areas of greatest emphasis lie within the overall scheme all tell us a great deal about how imperial power was perceived at any given time. In fact the same applies to a wide range of other means of symbolic expression: court ceremonial, religious ritual (notably the imperial cult), public festivals and works of art and architecture sponsored by or otherwise relating to the emperor. All these symbolic forms illuminate the ways in which political authority was perceived, and therefore reflect the collective response to that authority.[22]

In recent years a good deal of research has been conducted into a wider understanding of imperial power which pays particular attention to such ideas. The work of such scholars as Simon Price and Paul Zanker, to name but two, has opened up the possibility of analysing imperial power in the light of the full range of rituals and images that helped to make it acceptable in the perceptions of those subject to it. The re-evaluation of Roman history made possible by this new appreciation of what may be termed modes of symbolic representation has been particularly profound in respect of the reign of Augustus.[23] This approach has received broad acceptance in its application to the first two and a half centuries of the empire, and similar ideas have also been applied to the study of aspects of imperial power in the late empire.[24] The implications of such ideas for the mid-third century have not yet, however, been fully thought through.

This brings us back to the problem with which we began, namely the effect of the "tunnel" in the mid-third century. Some of the evidence necessary for the study of such symbolic forms has not survived for this crucial period. In particular, the literary sources which might have helped us to reconstruct some of the ritual and ceremonial action and the visual displays that accompanied them are largely untrustworthy.[25] For our period, the most comprehensive and the most direct evidence for the symbolic representation of Roman imperial authority is

provided by the imperial coinage and inscriptions. By looking at this evidence in detail I hope not only to shed some much-needed light into our "tunnel" but also to re-evaluate the legitimation of imperial authority in the mid-third century, and the rightful place of the political developments of that period of instability in the history of the Roman empire as a whole.

1.d The Purpose and Scope of this Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is, then, to study the range of verbal and visual symbols, and where the main areas of emphasis within this symbolism lie, in order to assess what this evidence can tell us about the legitimation of imperial authority in the mid-third century, and above all to see what light it may shed upon the reputed constitutional break (or "caesura") traditionally placed in this relatively obscure period. This analysis will also make possible a fresh examination both of the conventional distinction between those imperial contenders who are styled "legitimate emperors" and those who were merely "usurpers" (that is, the "dichotomy"), and of the relevance to our understanding of imperial authority in this period of the relative success of the western emperors (that is, the question of "Gallic separatism").

Of the six remaining chapters of the thesis, the first three are devoted to the analysis of the evidence I have outlined, while the last three are concerned with the wider issues entailed in the interpretation of this evidence. In order to be able to investigate the evidence in some depth, I have chosen to concentrate upon a few carefully selected reigns, falling between the years 253 and 275: those of Valerian and Gallienus, the western emperors and Aurelian. The comparisons offered by this selection will particularly help to clarify the questions I have raised. Owing to the increasing importance attached to the women and children of imperial families by this date, it is not only valid but indeed most important to consider the symbolism associated with the Augustae and the young Caesars in addition to that associated with the Augusti.[26]

A comprehensive catalogue of the coins and inscriptions of these reigns is both impracticable and unnecessary for our present purpose. At the same time the inadequacies of the surviving evidence and of the modern studies devoted to various aspects of this evidence also effectively rules out any purely statistical quantitative analysis. I shall start by offering, in chapter 2, a more detailed examination of the nature of the evidence to be surveyed, what it can tell us, what problems it presents us with and how it may be analysed. This chapter thus serves as an introduction to the survey that is to follow in the succeeding two chapters.

The symbolic imagery that we shall be studying in this survey falls into three groups. The first consists of those imperial titles displayed on the inscriptions, papyri and coins. The second consists of the insignia and dress, much of which the emperor probably bore in real life at least on certain occasions, and other iconographic devices such as attributes suggesting affiliation to some deity. The information here is drawn largely from the obverse iconography of the coinage. These first two groups will form the basis of chapter 3. The third group comprises a range of verbal and iconographic imagery which justified the exercise of imperial authority by the individual ruler in question through his association with both the qualities and the successes which were proof of his capacity and fitness to rule, through his special relationship with the gods, in whose lap the destiny of the empire was seen to lie, and through his identity with the quasi-sacral nature of imperial power itself. The principal source of this information is drawn from the reverse legends and iconography. This material will form the basis of chapter 4.

Once this detailed survey has been completed we shall be in a position, in chapter 5, to assess the overall picture that emerges of the symbolic representation of authority in this period and to distinguish what were the main areas of emphasis. In the light of the evidence studied it will then be possible to draw conclusions with regard both to "Gallic separatism" and to the "dichotomy". From these

conclusions it will become apparent that a thorough re-examination of the conventional approach to the study of imperial authority in the mid-third century is called for.

In chapter 6, I shall start by reviewing the extent to which the bias in the literary sources might have distorted both the role of senatorial recognition as an aspect of imperial legitimacy and the significance of the events of the third century in the development of imperial authority. It will then be possible to show how such distortions have affected the historiographical tradition in which historians in practice operate. I shall then suggest, as a way out of the difficulties, a more comprehensive way of looking at the central concepts of "power", "authority", "legitimation" and "usurpation" which allows for a more profound relationship between the symbolic representation of authority and the process of legitimation.

In the final chapter I shall apply the findings of the preceding chapters to the circumstances of the Roman empire of the mid-third century in order to arrive at a clearer understanding of the nature and operation of imperial authority at that time. This will enable us to see what constitutional requirements were in fact necessary for the functioning of imperial authority at this date. We shall be in a position to assess the true significance in the mid-third century of a number of

important factors such as legality, heredity, senatorial recognition, the city of Rome and the legacy of Augustus. In this way it will be possible to see what the symbolic representation of imperial authority in the third century can reveal about the supposed constitutional breakdown in that period, and what evidence there may be for significant continuity in this respect.

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATING THE NUMISMATIC AND EPIGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Before we can embark upon a survey of the symbolic representation of Roman imperial authority in the mid-third century, we should fully undertand the limitations of the evidence we are to use. In this chapter I shall discuss the present state of research in the relevant fields and clarify my position on certain controversies arising from this evidence, including an excursus on mint location and operation.

2.a Handling the Material Evidence

1) Introducing the evidence

The evidence for our survey, which is furnished by the imperial coinage and inscriptions of the reigns with which we are concerned (supplemented to a much smaller degree, for those emperors recognized in Egypt, by the surviving papyri and ostraca), may be referred to collectively as "material" sources, in contradistinction both to the literary and to "non-literary" sources.[1] The most notable advantage of such evidence over that supplied by the

literary sources is the fact that the information they provide is contemporary. In addition to this body of evidence there are other closely allied sources, as I have mentioned, which I have excluded from this study. Of these, two in particular deserve an explanation.

The first consists of works of art which in some sense refer to the emperor, notably portrait sculpture, but also relief sculpture, mosaics and other media. In practice, very little survives of such works of art from the reigns with which we are primarily concerned, and the little that does survive is so unevenly distributed (there is more pertaining to Gallienus than to all the rest put together) that the information supplied by these sources seems to me, after examination, to be of very limited use to us in the comparative study which follows. Naturally the mere existence of such material is pertinent to our inquiry, but the increment in our knowledge which this evidence would supply is too slight to make its inclusion worthwhile.[2]

The second, and perhaps more regrettable, deliberate omission is that of the local "civic" coinage. In addition to the information supplied by the coinage issued from imperial mints, there is a considerable body of information to be gleaned from the local coinage, referring to the emperor, that was issued by various individual city and provincial communities in the empire, notably in the eastern provinces. Even though the

representation of imperial authority on such coinage is no doubt germane to our inquiry, there are three reasons why I have decided to put this evidence to one side. First, the correlation and assessment of the evidence from these separate coinages presents grave organizational problems which serve to obscure rather than elucidate the lines of our inquiry. Secondly, the period with which we are primarily concerned, that is to say 253-275, witnessed a dramatic decline in the numbers of local civic mints, amounting (by the year 276) to a total collapse of the production of such coinage. This fact is in itself relevant, and we shall return to it shortly, but it adds to the complications of assessing the evidence from local coinage in this period. Thirdly, as with the sculpture and architecture, the information that can be extracted from this source adds very little to what we can ascertain from the other sources under investigation. For these reasons we may safely omit this evidence from our inquiry.[3]

Of the sources with which we shall be concerned, the imperial coinage is the most informative for our present purpose, providing both iconographic and verbal symbolism. Some of the coins minted during the mid-third century with rather more elaborate designs may have been issued for ceremonial or honorific purposes, rather than specifically as currency per se. Modern numismatic studies dealing with this period often attempt to differentiate these "medallions" from the rest of what we might call coins in

the strict sense. In practice, during the period with which we are concerned, this distinction is not very helpful. Though many of the objects referred to in modern numismatic catalogues as "medallions" may well have been struck with a primarily commemorative or honorific function, it is clear that most such "medallions" could and did serve as multiple denominations within the prevailing currency, or more simply as coins of intrinsic value.[4] Moreover, even where the function was primarily honorific rather than currency-related, the design and imagery employed on the disc necessarily forms part of the representation of imperial authority, and thus is clearly equally valid as evidence for our present inquiry. It is perfectly acceptable, therefore, to treat all the numismatic material together and allow such "medallions" to be subsumed under the general heading of "coinage", notwithstanding the distinction between the monetary and commemorative purposes for which they may primarily have been minted.

The relevant inscriptions of the period, though far less abundant and generally less informative than the coinage, nevertheless provide some valuable evidence for the representation of imperial authority. Not surprisingly, in view of the overall relative scarcity of inscriptions from this period, the survival of the epigraphic evidence is very uneven. The symbolism employed on the inscriptions is purely verbal, largely comprising imperial titles. The overlap between the numismatic and epigraphic

titulature is very great, though it is by no means perfect. Since the numismatic evidence we are concerned with here is that from the imperial mints, the chief discrepancy lies in the fact that, in addition to Latin, the epigraphy supplies us with Greek titulature, including titles that have no Latin equivalent. Details of where and when an inscription was erected (and even by whom) are more freely discernable than is possible with the coinage. This information can occasionally allow for somewhat greater precision with regard to regional and chronological variations in the symbolism used.[5]

The connection between the imperial titulature used in the papyri and the representation of imperial authority is comparable to that noted for inscriptions. Since the emperor's name and titles were often employed to ratify and date legally binding documents in Egypt, the dual "authorizing" function we noted for currency was also present to a degree in these documents. However, since the titles used in the papyrological evidence vary little from those employed in the epigraphy, and since it is by its very nature confined to Egypt, the value of the papyrological evidence is generally rather limited. In fact, its greatest advantage lies more in helping to sort out the tangled questions of chronology in this period.[6]

In order to make use of the material evidence available to us it must be arranged in a systematic way to allow simple and unambiguous reference while at the same time

conveying the maximum of relevant information. This presents us with few problems with regard to the epigraphic evidence. Problems do arise, however, with regard to the complexities of the numismatic evidence. Of the sources for the mid-third century with which we are concerned, the imperial coinage is by far the most plentiful; but its comparative abundance is something of a mixed blessing. The quantity and the variety of coins minted and the apparent contradictions that their classification provides actually render this wealth of information surprisingly intractable, especially with regard to interpreting the symbolism they contain.

ii) Problems of reference: corpora and catalogues

. One of the chief problems confronting the analysis of the coinage of the mid-third century is the lack of any authoritative and comprehensive numismatic corpus for this period to which easy reference may be made. Webb's Roman Imperial Coinage, volume V, now more than half a century out of date, still remains the only possible candidate. It is, however, very unsatisfactory: unreliable and lacking in discernment, particularly with regard to authenticity, Webb's lack of detail and conflation of different types, arranged merely as variant alternatives, is especially frustrating. The new edition, being undertaken by Dr. King, is still in preparation; even when it is finally ready for publication, it will only cover

the material down to the end of Gallienus' reign.[7] Unfortunately the catalogue of Roman Imperial coinage in the British Museum currently only reaches down to the reigns of Balbinus and Pupienus, though the catalogue of the Hunter Collection in Glasgow provides some helpful references for the period with which we are concerned. For the medallions and related material, the work of Gnecchi still remains the standard work.[8]

Monographs concentrating upon the coinage of one particular reign or the output of an individual mint are of immense value; unfortunately, however, they show an disinclination to correlate with previous work in the field, which at times borders on idiosyncrasy. Göbl's extremely important monographs on the coinage of the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus are an excellent case in point.[9] In these two articles, which to a large extent supplant the earlier work of Voetter, Göbl employs a unique and cumbersome system of references for his reverse iconography, involving three distinct numbering systems and a collection of miniature drawings; although the use of drawings has some advantages, as we shall see, the numbering systems are so confusing that Göbl himself makes several mistakes in their application. Certain other features of these works also make them harder to use: there is, for example, no numbering system in his catalogue to assist ease of reference; furthermore, his subdivisions of the issues and phases at each mint are sometimes unnecessarily complicated, and his dating of

these unwarrantably precise and on occasion seemingly arbitrary. In spite of these defects, however, these two articles provide an invaluable contribution to the study of Licinian coinage.[10]

The numismatic contributions of Alföldi, notably concerning the coinage of the Licinian period, include two very helpful articles on the complex coinage of the eastern mints and one as part of a series on the mint at Siscia. Regretably, he never compiled the proposed volume on the reign of Aurelian in his Siscia series.[11] In fact the study of Aurelian's coinage still remains in its infancy, in spite of two important monographs on the subject by Manns and Rohde, now fifty and one hundred years out of date respectively.[12] The coinage of the western emperors, by contrast, is among the best-documented of the period. Elmer's monograph on the subject, which supplanted the much earlier work by de Witte, has stood the test of time remarkably well. In addition the contributions by Lafaurie, Bastien and Schulte, among others, have greatly clarified the situation.[13]

With respect to the epigraphic evidence, in addition to the standard corpora and annuals, a few specific studies provide valuable reference: for Aurelian's reign, the catalogue provided by Homo, supplemented more recently by Sotgiu; for the western emperors, the catalogue provided by König. For papyrological evidence, besides the usual

corpora, the study of imperial titulature by Bureth, supplemented by the updates and corrections supplied by Slipesteijn, is invaluable. Over and above these works, special mention should be made of a very recent study by Peachin which attempts to synthesize all the titulature of the emperors of the mid-third century from Maximinus to Carinus. This work is invaluable with regard to the epigraphic material, but is sadly deficient with regard to the numismatic evidence.[14]

iii) Problems of interpretation

The coins not only bore the emperor's portrait, his titles and insignia, but also a host of other verbal and iconographic symbolism through which his authority was represented. The appearance of symbolic imagery on the reverse as well as the obverse of the coinage greatly increased the potential range of imperial ideology which could find expression. Since the republic, the potential for self-advertisement on the coinage had been very clearly understood in the Roman world. The enormous and unique potential for the canvassing of support and the orchestration of loyalty provided by the associations made possible in the combination of obverse and reverse designs was evidently not lost on the emperors. What we are dealing with here, however, is not a sophisticated and manipulative propaganda machine. There is an important distinction between the function of such symbolic

representations and what is conveyed by the term "propaganda". This term unavoidably suggests a specifically intentional, fully conscious and more or less cynical manipulation of popular responses to authority. By implication this dismisses too easily the importance of social structure and social needs in shaping these responses. In the Roman context at least, there is quite simply much less evidence for this kind of construction than is usually assumed. Furthermore, although propaganda has been put to very effective use at all periods in history, it has acquired overtones during the last one hundred years which make it an unsuitable term for a discussion of authority in the Roman empire. For these reasons, in spite of its obvious usefulness, I consider it advisable to avoid the term "propaganda" altogether.[15]

This brings us to the vexed question of the emperor's involvement in the choice of coin types, and his consequent control over the symbolism expressed therein. This has been a matter of hot debate since the middle of this century. Until that time there was among scholars working in the field a broad agreement on what today might seem a somewhat naive "propagandistic" understanding of the relationship between coin design and imperial authority.[16]

The current debate was opened in 1956 by A.H.M. Jones who rejected the very idea of inferring anything substantial concerning matters of policy or "propaganda"

from the choice of coin types as modern wishful thinking. He maintained that the choice of coin types was of little consequence to anyone and that emperors neither could nor would have become involved in such decisions, which he preferred to suppose were taken at a much lower level (either that of the mint operator, or even of the individual die-cutter). This sceptical side of the debate has been supported by several others since.[17] On the other side of this numismatic debate, championed above all by C.H.V. Sutherland, scholars continue to attach great significance to the choice of coin types, over which the emperor is seen as exercising his personal and careful control. The selection of types at any given time may thus be regarded as valuable evidence of imperial policy. Some scholars of this persuasion have even ventured to reconstruct the course of events of any given reign on the basis of coin types.[18]

If nothing else, the healthy debate which Jones' intervention has stimulated over the years has clearly demonstrated the lack of information we possess on so many aspects of the operation of mints in the Roman empire, from the logistical problems of getting bullion to and minted coins from the mints, to the executive problems of how, where, on what basis and by whom the designs of coins were chosen. On the other hand, the debate itself has tended to polarize the approaches of modern scholarship to the subject. The arguments of Sutherland and his followers remain somewhat unconvincing because they

stretch our meagre knowledge too far, while those of Jones and his followers are equally sweeping and tend to be unnecessarily dismissive.[19]

It may be, on a theoretical level at least, that the emperor had the ultimate say on what was to appear on coins minted in his name; the more distinctive types most likely do reveal the personal intervention of the emperors in whose reigns they were minted, or at the very least we can assume their tacit approval. (On the face of it, subordinates would be unlikely to depart noticeably from the norm on their own initiative.) We know next to nothing, however, about how often, in what ways and to what extent any given emperor was directly involved in the routine process of design selection. In all probability the frequency of such interventions must have varied according to circumstance and, no doubt, according to the temperament of the individual emperor concerned. That the emperor was capable of taking an active interest in such matters, however, is not to be doubted: the extraordinary extent to which the emperor did in fact involve himself personally in what might to us seem relatively unimportant minutiae of government has been clearly revealed by Fergus Millar.[20]

In view of our ignorance, we must be circumspect in our allegations of direct imperial involvement in any particular choice of coin type; but we do not need to establish that the emperor himself was regularly involved

in the choice of coin types to be able to understand that the symbolism used on the coinage was neither automatic nor gratuitous, and we are therefore not entitled to dismiss it as meaningless. The variety of different coin types used on the coinage of the Roman empire was very large relative to that found in other societies, and this variety in itself is suggestive of the importance attached to the symbolism. In this way we can be sure that the symbolic imagery that appears on the coinage has a fundamental bearing upon the ways in which political authority was viewed in the Roman empire. Futhermore, there is nothing to be gained by adding a specious further complexity to the problem by suggesting that in some sense the symbols that appear on the obverse are "official", while those on the reverse are to be understood as "semi-official". The distinction apparently derives from the idea that the emperor might dictate what appeared on the obverse but merely allow what appeared on the reverse. Whatever we may mean by such terms, the distinction is unhelpful. The obverse and reverse symbolism form part of the same matrix; both "represent images of authority".[21]

While the symbolism used forms part of a complex and intelligible expression of collective representation, there is a common assumption (in fact a further refinement of Jones' thesis) that whatever "meaning" might be attributed to the types produced in the first two centuries of the empire, the imperial coinage of the third century had largely degenerated into meaningless

repetitions of earlier types. Had mere mindless repetition been a factor, we would have expected a drastic diminution in the variety used during the third century, which is in fact not the case. On the contrary, the repeated use of tried and tested types suggests that they were, on the contrary, very "meaningful" indeed. This point is underlined by the fact that we know from the innovative types that were introduced that novelty was an option: it is therefore particularly noteworthy that it was an option that was, for the most part, exercised sparingly.

Today we happen to attach a great deal of importance to novelty (especially with regard to assessing artistic interest), but repetition is not ipso facto meaningless, especially in an age of uncertainties. We are not solely concerned with what is innovative in this material. As a response to changing circumstances, continuity is as important as innovation in respect to the perceptions that underscore political authority and thus to the nature of authority itself. Indeed given that repetition and continuity are important factors in this symbolism, our study must take full account of the usual as well as the unusual.

At this point I must voice a caveat in connection with the interpretation of the coin evidence for the mid-third century. Scholars on the less cautious wing of the debate on the interpretation of coins have tended to assert very

precise inferences from coin designs, not only concerning policy but also concerning the train of events. Such over-interpretations have led to serious problems concerning the nature and dating of such events in this period where other sources are so meagre. The situation is rapidly getting better due to the more stringent application of improved methods, but there remains a legacy of dubious chronological markers. The unreliable nature of most of the evidence for this period, notably of the literary evidence, has encouraged historians to rely very heavily upon the coinage to supply them with a chronological framework. In doing so they have relied upon the arrangements which numismatists have made. Unfortunately some of the absolute dates that numismatists have attached to individual coin types have been arrived at by relating the iconography of the coins to specific historical events (notably military campaigns). In doing so, they have had to rely upon the chronology supplied by historians. Quite apart from the problems of interpreting individual coin types in this way, the evident circularity resulting from this interchange has proved unhelpful; particularly so in the case of the western emperors, for whom there is no papyrological evidence.

Another bone of contention in the hermeneutic debate is the intended "audience" that some envisage for the imagery with which we are dealing. The obvious candidate for such a specific audience would have been the soldiers: a large proportion of the coins minted in the mid-third century

were indeed issued for the express purpose of paying the troops. On the other hand, the imperatives of taxation ensured that the coinage had a circulation that vastly exceeded the soldiery and civil service into whose hands it was first paid. However important we take the role of the armies to be, no explanation which requires the soldiers - or any other single group - to be the sole "target audience" can suffice to meet the complexities of the situation.

From a quite different and more interesting perspective, it is possible to see the emperor himself as an integral part of the "audience" for whom the symbolism on the coins was intended. There can be no denying that, at least to some extent, legitimation must depend upon the perceptions and desires of the ruled as well as those of the ruler. It is perfectly reasonable, therefore, to interpret at least some of the symbolism on the coins as representing how the public, or sections of it, would like to see the emperor, in addition to how the emperor would like to be seen by his subjects, or how they might imagine that he wished to be seen.[22] This idea is all the more attractive when we consider the verbal imagery that appears on inscriptions, where the desire to influence the divine or quasi-divine powers in the world is often expressed. On the whole it is preferable to see all those involved in the ramifications of imperial authority, from the emperor himself, through senators and army officers down to merchants, farmers and legionaries, as potential

"audiences" for the symbolism minted on the coinage. In practice there is no need to see the symbolic imagery as necessarily aimed at only one specific audience in order to consider it "meaningful".

The question is not at whom the symbolism may have been targeted, any more than it is precisely how the choice of symbolism was reached, but rather what patterns in the symbolic representation of authority can be discerned in the verbal and iconographic imagery that appeared in the designs. There is no validity in the objection, raised by Jones and his followers, that the ancients were not conscious of the question of signification in this sense, or at least that we have no evidence that they expressed any such awareness. This apparent lack does not entitle us to suppose that such matters were of no importance to them. Notions of signification and symbolic representation are, in their explicit forms, modern concerns and we should not expect to see them reflected overtly in the ancient literary accounts. Whatever the precise significance of this symbolism, at whomever it may have been directed, and however the choice of what was represented may have been arrived at, this material is a direct reflection of the prevalent contemporary attitudes towards imperial authority.

2.b Numismatic Classification and Arrangement

1) Problems of classification and arrangement

Roman imperial coinage is classified according to the emperor or empress in whose name the coin was minted, the type (its design and denomination), and the details of where and when it was issued. The first step in the classification of types is the denominational value of the coin, which for this period is based on the metal (gold, debased silver, or "billon", and various base-metal alloys of copper collectively referred to as "bronze"), weight and certain features of the design. The sharp debasement of the imperial coinage in the middle of the third century, involving both metal content and weight standards, has allowed a certain degree of confusion and inconsistency in modern nomenclature of the denominations.

To speak of "silver" coinage at all for this period is misleading: towards the end of Gallienus' reign the silver content of the antoninianus, the standard denomination in circulation, sank to about 1.5 - 3%, amounting in some cases to no more than a thin wash. The denominational value of these coins was signalled by the emperor's headgear which was in this case a radiate crown, whence the alternative name of "radiates". This iconographic distinction was, almost certainly, intended to denote twice the value of the smaller coins on which the emperor

is represented wearing the laurel crown, a similar distinction appearing in other metals. Production of the denarius, the older "laureate" coin, had all but ceased by this period. While the notations which appeared on the "silver" coinage after the reform of Aurelian have helped in the relative chronology of the coinage of his reign, the confusion arising from the possible denominational significance of these notations has done nothing to make the task of sorting out the precise relationships of these denominations any easier. In all probability, such confusion was also felt in ancient times, and can have done nothing to help steady the monetary uncertainty and concomitant inflation.[23]

The purity of the gold coinage of this period also fluctuated but never fell drastically. The fluctuations in weight standard, however, make certain coins difficult to categorize with absolute certainty; the difficulty is especially acute with the larger denominations (multiples) and "medallions". On the whole the designs used for gold vary little from the standard billon types, the exceptions being mostly linked to imperial celebrations and anniversaries, and presumably represent the coinage struck for the donatives associated with these occasions. In his article on the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus, Göbl suggested that the minting of gold coinage only took place when the emperor was at hand. There may well be some truth in this allegation, which is supported by other scholars in other contexts. Certainly, if true, it would

not be without its implications for the significance of the gold types. There is, however, very little evidence to go on either way. On the whole it appears unlikely that there was any such strict rule, and it remains dangerous to presume where corroborating evidence is wanting.[24]

The "bronze" coinage had been virtually squeezed out of the bottom end of the market by the inflation, and was consequently minted in much smaller quantities in this period than heretofore. With a few rare exceptions, their types tend to follow the lead set by the antoniniani. Most notable among these exceptions are the bronze "medallions" and the occasions when coins were minted in bronze using dies apparently intended for gold, to judge by their fine workmanship and iconography. These "Abschläge", as they are generally known, may have been intended as trial runs; though the surprisingly large number of such types attested only in bronze, notably for Postumus, has given rise to much controversy and confusion.[25]

The great abundance of coins from this period is due in part to the augmented rate of production during the mid-third century. The increment was itself both a cause and an effect of the increasing debasement and spiralling inflation of the period.[26] This vicious circle had several effects, both direct and indirect, upon the coinage.

Increased output, no doubt aggravated by haste, contributed to a decrease in the quality of some (though not all) of the operational management of the mints, which has marginally contributed to the confusion. As a result of carelessness or fraud in the production of coinage in this period, there is a surprising number of coins in which the reverse and obverse do not properly belong together (hybrids and mules). Although these make it more difficult to assign reverse types to individual emperors or to individual issues, they do also add some extremely useful extra information with regard to relative dating. The ancient habit of restriking without melting down, which the increased output also encouraged, can add information regarding relative chronology, but all too often it produced coin types that are difficult to decipher. Counterfeiting was not at all uncommon at this date, made easier by the political confusions of the period. Vast numbers of so-called "barbarous radiates" were created, and these along with other possible (but rather better) ancient counterfeits, and together with a significant number of modern (that is post-mediaeval) forgeries, have greatly added to the confusion.[27]

To a much lesser degree, the quality of the die-cutting involved in the production of the ordinary billon and bronze types was also affected by the increase in output. However, the opposite is to some extent true for the dies destined for gold types in this period: the care and attention lavished on these dies actually increased as the

designs themselves became more adventurous, especially under Gallienus and Postumus.[28]

The greater volume of output also necessitated the multiplication of mint operations, and this in turn has added to the confusions over coin classification. The period with which we are concerned coincided with the fastest growth in the number of separate imperial mints operating at different locations around the Roman empire, as well as the fastest increment in their combined output. The identification of the issuing mint is complicated by the fact that, in spite of the proliferation of imperial mints at this date, the practice of mint-marking was sporadic; indeed it did not become a standard feature of Roman currency until the end of the third century.[29] The assignment of coins to specific minting operations and the location of these minting operations are to be distinguished, in that there is sometimes agreement on whether certain coins were minted at the same place but dispute as to where that place was (see below, 2.c).

The arrangement of the coins within issues and the relative sequence of these issues within the output of a particular mint is very often a question of relative rather than absolute chronology. The length and style of the obverse legend can be an indication as to the (relative) date, and even to the place of issue, though a certain amount of caution must be applied here. The variety of obverse types used in this period, especially

notable as a feature of Gallienus' sole reign coinage, can be both a help and a hindrance in sorting out place and date of issue. Stylistic analysis, also helpful in this respect, demands a highly experienced eye, and there clearly still remains a subjective element in the arrangement of the coinage within mints, sequences and dates.[30]

The problems confronting numismatists concerning mint allocation, dating and issue sequence to some extent stem from an imperfect understanding of the workings of the imperial mints in this period. Although mint output in this period does not appear to fall into any neat and comprehensive pattern that can be readily discerned today, many scholars have still tried to impose one. The rigours of arrangements whereby numismatists restrict an issue to minimal variations of obverse or reverse legends, or divide the material into annual issues seem to owe more to neatness of form than to any evidence in the material itself.[31] However, recent advances in both technique and methodology are now gradually clarifying the situation.

ii) Advances in numismatic technique

One of the most fruitful areas of research in recent years has been the opportunities provided by the careful analysis of coin hoards. In addition to increased output, the comparative abundance of mid third-century coinage is simply due to the better rate of survival, resulting

chiefly from an increase in the instances of hoarding during this period, or rather in the number of hoards that were never recovered in antiquity. This fact in itself is naturally a testament to the greater insecurity of the period with which we are concerned. The potential value of the careful analysis of coin hoards is now also rapidly becoming clearer. If carefully handled, the hoards can reveal a considerable amount of information about (relative) dating and the relationship of different coin issues; with due caution, they can even tell us something concerning mint location. In this way, thanks largely to a much greater attention to detail, the excellent results of these studies are currently making among the most significant contributions to the subject. Among the hoards recently published which have made considerable contributions to our understanding of the coinage of this period special mention should be made of four. Two large hoards analysed by the British Museum (the Cunetio and the Normanby hoards), both rich in the billon coinage of the Licinii and the western emperors in particular, have revealed a very great deal of information concerning the coinage of these emperors, including a serious revision of the location and interrelation of the mints operating for them (below, 2.c and 2.d). Two others (the Sirmium and the Maravelle hoards) have between them shed some much needed light on the coinage of Aurelian's reign.[32]

The study of die-linking is another area in which numismatic research has recently made great advances.

These studies can be especially useful in determining the sequence of coin issues and the workings of the individual mints. Outstanding among the works on our period which make extensive and instructive use of die studies are Schulte's painstaking study of the gold issues of the western emperors, the studies by Shiel and Gilljam on the coinage of Saloninus as Augustus and the monographs by Gilljam on the coinage of Laelian. Die studies have also been used, together with the information from hoards, to draw inferences concerning the quantities of coins minted in particular issues, though the usefulness of such inferences is severely limited by our lack of precise knowledge on the operation of mints in this period.[33]

As the mid-third century is a period of particularly drastic debasement, both in terms of weight and fineness, it is possible to gain some additional information on the date and location of issue of the coins based upon the variations that can be detected by "scientific" analysis. Recent improvements in the techniques of numismatic analysis offer considerable scope. For example, the weighing and measuring of coins has become a much more precise and reliable numismatic tool due to the increased accuracy of modern electronic equipment. The use of applied statistics has also greatly helped. Even more important are the improvements in the analysis of the varying proportions in the metal content of coins.

Great advances have been made both in well established techniques, such as gravimetric analysis, and above all in the introduction of new technologies such as chemical (nitric acid precipitation) analysis, x-ray fluorescent spectrometry (XRF), proton induced x-ray emission (x-ray crystallography) and neutron activation analysis. Even so it should be borne in mind that such techniques are still far from perfected, not least because of the bias produced by factors like surface enrichment in certain techniques (notably XRF). The standard methods of reducing the ill effects of this factor, namely the removal of the outermost surface of the coins under examination, is particularly problematic for this period when coins appear to have been "washed" in silver to improve their appearance. Furthermore, the alloy mixtures in the billon of the mid-third century antoninianus are far from uniform within any particular coin, so that the results so far obtained from many studies have often been bewildering if not erratic, and must still be treated with caution. Within cautious limitations, however, studies that reveal such details as the presence and proportions of certain trace elements can be very helpful indeed.[34]

The refinements in modern numismatic methodology and techniques, especially in the areas of metrology, chemical analysis, hoard analysis and die studies, are being applied to an ever increasing data-base. The result is a rapidly improving clarity, from which no period of Roman history has benefited as much as the third century.

2.c Controversies of Chronology and Mint Location

Due to the present state of the material sources (the unreliability of the literary accounts and the self-contradictions of epigraphic, numismatic and papyrological testimony) the chronology of the mid-third century is notoriously problematic. However, a broad consensus is finally beginning to emerge. The location and operation of the mints of this period present two major areas of contention which cannot conveniently be dealt with under the heading of individual mints. These I shall consider here separately along with some other comparatively minor details. A full discussion of the location and operation of each of the mints in this period will then follow in the next section (below, 2.d).

1) Consular, tribunician and Egyptian regnal dating

The chronology of this period depends to a great extent upon the enumeration of the reigning emperor's tribunician power and of his consulships. The former was augmented annually, though there is considerable debate as to whether or not this augmentation continued, during our period, to take place on the traditional day of 10 December, the beginning of the republican tribunician year. Imperial consulships were also enumerated, the tally being augmented each time the emperor took another

consulship. These tallies were often, but by no means always, mentioned on the coins and inscriptions. There are, however, a bewildering number of errors, including numerous instances where the combination of tribunician years and consulships is simply impossible on any reckoning. Two factors have complicated the situation: first, the relevant numerals are sometimes placed before rather than after the title to which they refer; secondly, the numeral is often omitted from one title but included in the other (almost always in such cases it is the tribunician power which lacks enumeration).[35]

Various attempts have been made to resolve the resulting chronological perplexities. It has been argued, for example, that Gallienus broke with the tradition of the tribunician year using, at least from 260, his dies imperii or some other date. The same notion has also been argued for Aurelian. The evidence for such departures from tradition is very inconclusive, and it is preferable, on balance, to continue to regard 10 December as the beginning of the tribunician year for all the reigns with which we are directly concerned, including those of the western emperors.[36]

Similar chronological tangles involving the computation of Egyptian regnal years are also known for this period. The chronology of events surrounding the accession and regnal dating of Aurelian have proved perplexing, although the circumstances are now becoming clearer. Until late

June 272 it was assumed in Egypt that his dies imperii followed that of Quintillus (who was proclaimed in Rome after 29 August, that is in the Egyptian year 270/71). From late June 272, when he recaptured Egypt from the Palmyrenes, Aurelian's regnal years were calculated on the basis of 269/70 being his year one, implying that he had been proclaimed at Sirmium directly following the death of Claudius there (presumably mid-to-late August 270). The timing of this change and the reasons for it are somewhat obscured by the domination of Egypt by Palmyra, but it probably represents a conscious policy on the part of Aurelian to marginalize the reign of Quintillus.[37]

ii) The eastern mints, 253-68

The location of imperial mints in the eastern provinces during the period of Gallienus' reign, their interrelation, the dates of their activity and even their number are currently undergoing considerable rethinking. There are at least seven, possibly nine distinguishable series of coinage involved. Conventionally they are arranged as follows:[38]

At Antioch in the joint reign:

a) Three issues covering the early years of the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus (253-5).

b) Two issues covering the period 256-8.

<u>At a second eastern mint</u>:

c) Three issues (the last with distinctive marks) running from ca. 255 to the capture of Valerian in 260.

d) An issue for Gallienus as sole emperor, which from its marks and its obverse and reverse typology appears to continue on from the preceding series (c). A small number of these coins differ stylistically sufficiently for some scholars to believe them to be a separate mint operation.[39]

e) A series of coins issued in the names of Macrianus and Quietus, clearly from the same mint operation as (d). Among these also the same stylistic varients are found as in series (d); again these may represent a separate mint.[40]

<u>At Antioch in the sole reign</u>:

f) A series of issues for Gallienus and Salonina covering the period from 263 to Gallienus' death in 268.[41]

<u>At a new eastern mint</u>:

g) A series of coins, usually arranged in two issues, for Gallienus and Salonina with the mark SPQR in the exergue dated to the end of the sole reign.

The location of the joint reign series (a) and the sole reign series (f) at Antioch is secure, due to the continuity from the coinage of Trebonianus Gallus and Volusian in the former case and to Claudius and beyond in the latter. In addition to these two series, however, a recent and as yet unpublished revision assigns (c) and

(d), as well as the Macrianic coinage (e), to Antioch, while placing (b) alone at a "second mint". This arrangement, which will essentially be that employed in the new edition of RIC now in preparation, is the one I have followed here.[42]

The SPQR coins (g) have a close correlation with the other eastern coinage of this date (alongside which they were once placed), but they clearly represent the output of a new mint. By the reign of Claudius II, judging by the distribution of these coins in hoards, there can be little doubt that the mint responsible for these coins lay somewhere in western Asia Minor, probably Cyzicus. Where it was under Gallienus remains more problematic: Cyzicus was rejected by Alföldi and by Göbl, who settled upon Ephesus; locations further east have also been suggested.[43]

iii) The western mints, 257-75

The mints in the western provinces at this date have also proved problematic and their traditional arrangement has also undergone a similar revision in recent years, though in this case the revision is more widely acknowledged. We know that the main body of the mint Gallienus set up in Gaul to finance his military operations on the Rhine in the late 250s passed intact into the hands of Postumus in 260.[44] Some of Postumus' last issues bear markings indicating that they were minted

at Cologne, and since we are told in some of the literary sources that Saloninus was besieged in Cologne in 260, the traditional assumption has been to place Gallienus' (and therefore Postumus') mint at Cologne.[45] A separate series of coins was also minted for Marius, Victorinus and the Tetrici, and since it is known that some mint activity was operating around this time at Trier, the traditional assumption here has been that a second subsidiary mint was operating at Trier at least from the reign of Victorinus.[46]

Recently, however, it has been proposed that Trier was the location of the principal mint in the area right from the time of its establishment by Gallienus, and that Cologne was a subsidiary mint set up by Postumus in 268 to be nearer his military operations on the middle Rhine.[47] This revision is compelling, and is now beginning to meet with wide acceptance. It fits the chronological requirements of the autumn of 260 far better.[48] It is also supported by various numismatic observations concerning the revolt of Laelian.[49]

There remains the question of a mint operation located at Lugdunum at this time. Webb locatated the Licinian mint here, allowing Postumus to transfer the mint to Cologne at the end of his reign; but this notion is no longer tenable. Others have suggested that the western emperor's second mint was transferred to Lyon at some point during the reigns of Marius, Victorinus or Tetricus;

but this too is improbable in view of the proximity of Lyon to the forces loyal to the central emperors.[50] Furthermore, the substantial number of hybrids between the types of the two mints operating for Tetricus towards the end of his reign point to the proximity of the two mints, if not to their actual amalgamation. It was Aurelian, therefore, who transferred the mint south.[51]

iv) Other numismatic controversies of the period

COINS MARKED SP, PII, RP (ca. 265): A small number of coins were minted for Gallienus and Salonina with the distinctive marks SP and PII, having affinities to the coinage of Siscia, where they were once allocated. In workmanship and type, they also closely resemble contemporary coins from Rome, and are not out of place, in either weight or alloy, beside their Roman counterparts. Alföldi attributed them to a short-lived mint in Pannonia Inferior (thus S[ecunda] P[annonia]) at Sirmium (Sremska Mitrovica). However, the analogous mark RP for Salonina on coins usually allocated to the last Latin-marked issue from Rome has encouraged speculation that all these coins represent the work of Roman personnel. If the place of these coins in the transition from Latin to Greek marks at Rome is accepted, their relationship to the Siscian mint remains unclear.[52]

MINT-RELATED EVENTS IN THE REIGN OF AURELIAN: At some point during Aurelian's reign, we know from the literary

sources, there was a large-scale revolt of the mint workers at Rome led by one Felicissimus. There is a suggestion that this event was connected to the monetary reform Aurelian introduced towards the end of his reign, now dated convincingly to the early spring of 274 (just prior to his invasion of Gaul).[53] There are now good grounds, however, for linking the mint workers' revolt with a much earlier event. When Aurelian first reached Rome, which was not until the summer of 271, he found it in the grip of serious sedition. The otherwise unexplained closure for some two years of the mint of Rome, which took place precisely in the summer of 271, might be due to the involvement of the mint workers in the civil unrest of that year.[54] Recent numismatic evidence concerning the level of fraudulent minting involved in the Roman output of the DIVO CLAVDIO issue supports this hypothesis. The types initially issued for Aurelian from the four mints under his direct control which he inherited from his predecessors (Rome, Milan, Siscia and Cyzicus; Antioch was under Palmyrene control) continued much as in the previous reigns. This has made the great consecration issue for Divus Claudius, minted at the same four mints, difficult to date with precision. However, the evidence now conclusively indicated that the consecration issue dates from early in Aurelian's reign, following and to some extent overlapping the first issues in Aurelian's own name at these mints.[55]

THE MURDER AND POSTHUMOUS COINAGE OF AURELIAN: As he mustered his troops for an eastward assault against the Persians, late in the autumn of 275, en route from Perinthus (Heraclea) to Byzantium, Aurelian was assassinated at Caenophrurium, apparently the outcome of a private plot rather than a political coup.[56] The news of this act, in a world well used to regicide, still is said to have caused sufficient shock for some time to have elapsed before a new emperor was finally proclaimed in the person of the elderly and ill-fated Tacitus. The length (and even existence) of this reputed "interregnum" remains controversial: Aurelian was still alive in September and Tacitus is likely to have acceded before (perhaps some time before) 10 December; the interregnum, if there was one, is likely to have lasted less than six weeks rather than over six months.[57] Late in 275, apparently after the Aurelian's murder, there is some evidence that a final issue was minted for Severina alone, at least at Rome and Ticinum. This coinage is thought by some to represent the output for the "interregnum"; the evidence for such an issue is slight, however, and the notion cannot be pushed too far.[58]

2.d Excursus on the Roman Imperial Mints, AD 253-275

1) The mints of Valerian, Gallienus and family, 253-68

ROME (Rom): Rome was unquestionably the most important imperial mint during these reigns, apparently in operation continually throughout. From Valerian's accession until several years after his capture, the mint at Rome operated with six officinae (often identified by Latin ordinal marks: P, S, T, Q, V, VI). In the the middle of sole reign (perhaps in 265-6) the practice changed, though precisely how and when is still disputed. It seems the number of workshops was augmented, probably first to nine, then to a total of twelve (employing a combination of Greek and Latin marks: A-H; N-XII respectively).[59]

VIMINACIUM (Vim): It is now generally agreed that the Balkan mint which was the first to start issuing coins in the name of Valerian when he revolted against Aemilianus had been established some time earlier at Viminacium (Kostolac) in Moesia Superior. This mint continued in operation, including issues for Valerian II, until approximately 257. No further coins were issued from here after the death of Valerian II, but it is not likely that this event was the occasion of the mint's closure.[60]

THE GALLIC MINT (Tre): The Gallic coinage of the joint reign was produced at a single mint, apparently operating with three officinae. It was established by Gallienus to

satisfy the needs of his Rhenish campaigns, probably at Augusta Treverorum (Trier) some time early in 257. The workmanship of this new mint seems to be a continuation of that at Viminacium, the employees of which, we may thus assume, accompanied Gallienus to Gaul.[61] This mint continued briefly to issue for the Licinii after Valerian's capture and was the only mint to issue coins for Saloninus as Augustus.[62]

MILAN (Med): Towards the end of the joint reign (probably late 259) a new mint was set up, very likely by removing workmen from the mints in Rome and Gaul. This mint must have been located at Mediolanum (Milan), since its production continued unbroken down to the introduction, late in the sole reign, of distinctive mint marks.[63] It had time for but one issue before the news of Valerian's fate arrived from the east. Thereupon it began to mint a series of legionary types. Early in 268, if not just before, the mint ceased abruptly to coin for Gallienus. The explanation lies in the revolt of Aureolus, the cavalry commander stationed at Milan. The city and its mint were not recovered from the rebel until after the murder of Gallienus.[64]

SISCIA (Sis): The Danubian region remained without an imperial mint after the removal of the Viminacium mint until one was set up at Siscia (Sisak) in the sole reign. The location of the mint is indicated by the sporadic appearance of the mint mark S and by the early reverse

legend SISCIA AVG. The timing of the event is less certain, but may be placed in 262 at the earliest. The workmanship clearly indicates that it was set up by personnel sent out from the mint of Rome. The mint operated more or less continuously for the rest of the reign.[65]

ANTIOCH (Ant): The mint at Antioch operated without significant break from its first issue for Valerian down to the seizure of the mint by the Macriani in the late summer of 260. Late in 263 Antioch recommenced minting in the name of Gallienus, which it continued to do until his death; in reality, however, his political control of this area remained tenuous.[66]

A SECOND (?) EASTERN MINT (Sam): A subsidiary mint operation was set up by Valerian, possibly in the middle of the joint reign (ca. 256), presumably to be closer at hand for his field operations on the Euphrates border. This may perhaps have been a moneta comitatensis drawn from the main mint at Antioch, with which it clearly maintained a close connection. If indeed geographically separate, the location of this "second eastern mint" may have been at Samosata (Samsât), though Emesa (Homs) is also a candidate; a site any further from Antioch is extremely improbable. This series of coins ended in 258.[67]

THE ASIAN MINT (Cyz): The SPQR coinage dates from the last years of the sole reign: three tribunician years are

attested on these coins, but the evident errors involved in their computation make dating difficult. The location of this mint remains uncertain; in the absence of a consensus "Cyzicus" at least serves to identify the coins in question and to indicate its relation to the Aurelianic series (see below).[68]

ii) The mints of the western emperors, 260-74

THE PRINCIPAL GALLIC MINT (Tre): Postumus inherited the bulk of Gallienus' mint operation in Gaul (probably situated at Trier). This continued to function for Postumus without perceptible breaks down to his death in 269, the last issues being of lower weight standard. On Postumus' death the operation of this mint passed directly over to Marius, thence to Victorinus and finally to Tetricus. After four issues for Tetricus (including one for his son), the weight standard was slightly increased.[69]

THE SECOND GALLIC MINT (Col): In 268 Postumus set up a subsidiary mint. It was most likely this workshop, rather than the principal mint, that was located at Colonia Agrippina (Cologne). In 269 this secondary mint fell into the hands of Laelian, who either continued to operate it from Cologne or, as seems more likely, transferred it to his stronghold at Mogontiacum (Mainz). Subsequently it continued to function for Marius and his successors at Cologne until, after minting six relatively brief issues

for Tetricus I, the last jointly with his son, the workshop was almost certainly amalgamated with the main operation at Trier in the winter of 273/4.[70]

MILAN (Med): The Milan-style coinage in the name of Postumus is now, following Alföldi, universally accepted as the product of the Milan mint during the occupation of that city by Aureolus in 268, who apparently did not feel strong enough to withstand Gallienus on his own and threw in his lot with Postumus. The coins, in five issues, almost all praise the cavalry, units of which had been stationed in Milan by Gallienus to form a mobile strike force to deal with the threat to Italy posed both by Germanic tribes such as the Alamanni and by Postumus himself.[71]

iii) The mints of Aurellan's reign, 270-75

GALLIC MINTS (Tre; Lug): Following the battle of Châlons Aurellan gained possession of the Gallic mint which, after one brief issue, he relocated to Lugdunum (Lyon) in the late summer of 274. Though there had been no imperial mint here since the defeat of Clodius Albinus in 197, the addition of the letter L to the officina marks renders the attribution secure. Here the mint issued one type each for Aurellan and Severina in three quick issues, differentiated only by their mint marks. Numerically speaking, the coins produced for Aurellan from the Gallic mint, at either location, were insignificant.[72]

ROME (Rom): After the initial issues the mint of Rome was closed down. After a gap of two years, minting recommenced at Rome in the summer of 273, with two very brief issues, containing a variety of types; thereafter the types produced were almost exclusively solar.[73] Some months into the reform period, perhaps at the end of 274, the mint began to issue coins for Severina as well. The output of the Roman mint was never very great during this reign, though it did issue some rare denarii.[74]

MILAN (Med): After the initial issues the number of workshops at the Milan mint was increased to four. The mint continued to operate down to the beginning of 274, when it was transferred. Its last issues were exclusively solar.[75]

TICINUM (Tic): At the moment of the monetary reform the Milan mint was transferred to Ticinum (Pavia). Once again the types were almost exclusively solar. As at Rome, coins were minted for Severina alongside those for her husband from the end of 274. Studies of hoards have shown that the mints of the Po valley account for perhaps 40% of all the antoniniani minted for Aurelian.[76]

SISCIA (Sis): The mint of Siscia appears to have been a very important mint for Aurelian, responsible for approximately one quarter of the coinage of his reign. After the initial issues it produced coins for Aurelian with a range of types which, as elsewhere, became predominantly solar from the summer of 273. After the

first post-reform issue, Siscia also began to mint for Severina.[77]

SERDICA (Ser): Having pulled back from trans-Danubian Dacia and set up a new province south of the river in 271, Aurelian established a mint at the newly elevated capital city of Serdica (Sophia), with workmen apparently taken from Rome. The first coins issued here bear the mark SERD in the exergue. Though Jupiter dominated the early issues, the connection between this mint and Sol is especially pronounced. Coins for Severina are very rare from this mint, but many of the most remarkable coins issued in Aurelian's name were minted here.[78]

UNCERTAIN (BALKAN) MINT (Byz): As he prepared for his eastern campaign against Palmyra at the beginning of 272 Aurelian set up a new mint in the eastern Balkans, apparently consisting of personnel withdrawn from Milan. In its earlier issues, which probably lasted through the summer, this mint occasionally placed a dolphin in the exergue. Callu suggested this most probably indicated Byzantium, though other locations have been put forward. The last issue from this mint closed early in the spring of 273, late enough to hail the emperor as Restitutor Orbis, but not late enough to embark on the predominantly solar programme found at every other mint.[79]

CYZICUS (Cyz): After the early issues, the mint at Cyzicus operated with two, three, four and later (from mid 273) five workshops, by which time its types were, as

elsewhere, dominated by Sol. There were two post-reform issues, the second of which also contained coins for Severina, though as at Siscia the number of coins minted for her here is small.[80]

ANTIOCH (Ant): The first issues of this reign from the mint of Antioch recognized Aurelian and Vaballathus jointly, then Vaballathus and Zenobia alone. From early in 273, however, once the area had been wrested from Palmyrene control, coins began to be minted for Aurelian and, towards the end of 274, for Severina also.[81]

TRIPOLIS (Trp): Early in 274, shortly before the reform, a supplementary eastern mint was set up at Tripolis. Only two reverse types can be identified for certain as the work of this mint for Aurelian; the sequence of these may be determined from the mint marks. No coins were minted here for Severina.[82]

CHAPTER 3

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATIONS OF IMPERIAL AUTHORITY:

I. TITLES, INSIGNIA AND ATTRIBUTES

The strong correlation between the prevailing perceptions of imperial authority in a given period and the symbolic imagery used in, among other media, the contemporary coins and inscriptions enables the analysis of this symbolism to reflect upon the nature and workings of imperial authority at that time. In order to assess the symbolism associated with imperial authority in the mid-third century it is necessary to consider the evidence supplied by the coins and inscriptions in some detail. Since the classification and the arrangement of this material evidence are at present still problematic (for the reasons given above in chapter 2) and thus inadequate for the purpose, a systematic presentation and analysis of the evidence is required. It will thus be possible to arrive at a proper assessment of the emphasis within the symbolic representation of authority and to draw comparisons between the cases of the central and the western emperors. The present chapter deals with the titles and insignia; the following chapter deals with other symbolic means of associating the emperor with perceived sources of power, such as the army and the gods.

Of the numerous titles attested for Roman emperors during the mid-third century, certain may be regarded as the core elements of Roman imperial titulature at this date. These I shall refer to as "standard" titles. Beyond these there are a large number of other titles that may be termed "sporadic". These terms do not have a strict correlation with frequency, because occasionally certain titles of the second category may have a particular vogue for a while, as with the title Restitutor Orbis during the latter half of Aurelian's reign. Having dealt with these titles in the first two sections of this chapter, I shall then go on to review the insignia, dress and attributes used on the coinage of these emperors and finally I shall turn to the titles and insignia employed for other members of the imperial house.

3.a Standard Roman Imperial Titulature

i) Principal elements of the standard titulature

Though the arrangement and number of titles can vary from one document to another, the following generic reconstruction illustrates the typical arrangement in which the principal elements of the standard titulature are found: imperator caesar [the emperor's personal names] plus felix augustus pontifex maximus tribunicia potestas consul pater patriae proconsul. Of these, the titles down

to and including the title Augustus may be regarded as "primary"; these appear on the coin obverses and are found in inscriptions throughout the empire and also in the papyri.

Those that follow the title Augustus may be referred to as "secondary". They are also found in inscriptions, but with much less regularity; in the (largely Greek) inscriptions from the eastern provinces of the empire they are very rarely to be found, and in the papyri not at all. This geographical bias strongly implies that the significance of these secondary titles was far less in this region. Since the majority of these secondary titles ultimately refer to positions of authority originally associated with the city of Rome, this is perhaps not so surprising. With the exception of proconsul (an exception which dates from the beginning of the empire), the secondary titles are also found on the coinage, but here again far less frequently than the primary titles: for the most part, the secondary titles are to be found only on certain specific "titular" reverse types (PM TR P COS PP, or some variant).

Most of these standard titles can be traced back to the canon laid down in the reign of Augustus. Only two elements of this titulature enter the canon substantially later: Pius was first taken as a cognomen by Antoninus, and subsequently adopted by Commodus who added Felix; the standard use of this pair of titles was confirmed by

Caracalla. The symbolism of the emperor as both plus and felix, however, originated with Augustus. The title Pontifex Maximus remained the sole property of the most senior emperor down to the third century. Starting with the joint reign of Balbinus and Puplenus Maximus (AD 238), however, the title had come to be shared by all reigning Augusti. The title conveyed much more than the designation of a priestly office, with specific religious duties in Rome: it formed a crucial part of the representation of imperial authority which stressed the emperor's association with the gods who governed Rome's destiny and with the eternity of Rome itself (symbolized in the Vestal fire). By the mid-third century it had clearly come to function as part of the sine qua non titulature suggesting imperial status.[1]

As a general rule on mid-third century coinage, the earliest obverses of a reign would be likely to give the fullest rendition of the emperors personal names and appropriate titles. Thereafter successively fewer names and titles are included. The measure of importance attached to the primary titles can be judged by which titles are most frequently omitted and which, conversely, are the most indispensable. By this token, the titles can be arranged in ascending order of importance as follows: Felix, Pius, Caesar, Imperator, Augustus; so that, at its minimum, the obverse legend could simply read the emperor's personal cognomen together with the title Augustus. The paramount importance of the title Augustus

in the overall scheme of Roman imperial titulature suggested by this fact is illuminating.[2]

Imperial consulships retained a particular symbolic significance in this period. Among the prerogatives a Roman emperor enjoyed was that of designating the consuls and of taking the consulship for himself whenever it suited him to do so. The exercise by any would-be emperor of this imperial prerogative was a vital aspect of the manifestation of his imperial authority. As a measure of the importance attached to this prerogative, a newly established emperor customarily assumed the ordinary consulship in the very first January following his accession; the Licinii did so in 254 and Aurelian in 271. Since Valerian had held a consulship prior to his accession, he was COS II in 254. Aurelian's first consulship is noteworthy for being taken in absentia: retained on the Danube by barbarian incursions, he assumed his first consulship at his winter headquarters in Siscia without yet having set foot in Rome.[3]

In addition to this first imperial consulship, the emperor would often also assume a second one in the very next year, as Valerian and Gallienus did in 255. It was also customary for emperors to assume the consulship to coincide with their quinqennalian and decennalian celebrations, though the evidence for this custom is not conclusive in the mid-third century, due to the insecurities of dating and the brevity of most of the

reigns.[4] The evidence for the reigns with which we are concerned here, however, does corroborate the idea: Valerian and Gallienus in 257; Gallienus again in 262; Aurelian in 274. The pattern of imperial consulships dictated by these concerns can be seen in table 3:1 below.

Table 3:1

Imperial Consulships AD 254-75
Showing the years in which emperors took imperial consulships with special reference to the significant regnal years: 1st and 2nd Cos years of reign; quinquennalian and decennalian years

	Emperors at Rome:			Western emperors:			
Date:	V	G	A	P	Vi	T	T2
254	Cos II	I (1)					
255	Cos III	II (2)					
256	-	-					
257	Cos IV	III (Q)					
258	-	-					
259	-	-					
260	-	-					
261		Cos IV (*a)		Cos II	(1)		
262	Cos V (D)			Cos III	(2)		
263	-						
264	Cos VI			-	(Q!)		
265	-			-			
266	Cos VII		}	Cos IV [I]	(*b)		
267	-		}				
268	-			-			
269				Cos V	(D)		
270				}			
271		Cos I (1)		} Cos II	(*c)		
272					Cos I		(1)
273					Cos II		(2)
274		Cos II (Q)			Cos III	I	(*d)
275		Cos III					

KEY: V, Valerian; G, Gallienus; A, Aurelian;
P, Postumus; Vi, Victorinus; T, Tetricus I; T2, Tetricus II.
(1) indicates first consular year of reign; (2) indicates second;
(Q) indicates quinquennalian year; (D) indicates decennalian year.

NOTES:
(*a) The first consular year of Gallienus' sole reign.
(*b) P's Cos IV (year uncertain) was Vi's (non-imperial) Cos I.
(*c) Vi's Cos II, date uncertain: on both his Coss, see Ch.3, n.5.
(*d) The joint consulship of the Tetrici was associated with decennalian vota (though not actually in a quinquennalian year).

That the same concerns, manifested in the same pattern, applied to the western emperors as well (see the right hand side of table 3:1) is very relevant to our understanding of both the authority of the western emperors and the function of the consulship in this period. The western emperors were represented as adhering closely to the Roman model of imperial consulships even though in reality their "consulships" bore no relation to the office of consul at Rome. Postumus and Tetricus assumed the ordinary consulship in the first January of their reigns, and both went on to take another consecutive consulship in the following year. Postumus' first imperial consulship, in 261, is in fact recorded on his coins and inscriptions as his second overall. Whether the general had been granted consular honours by Valerian prior to his usurpation, or whether he assumed them in 260 as a result of it, is not certain. Although the evidence is inconclusive, it is possible that Victorinus delayed his first imperial consulship until January 271, which would have been unusual.[5] Postumus also took the consulship in honour of his decennalia in 269, as imperial custom dictated, though he had declined to take one in his quinquennalian year (table 3:1, above).

Tetricus' assumption of a third consecutive consulship, at first sight unusual, was taken to mark the elevation of his son to the consulship, and as such was in keeping with Roman imperial custom dating back to the first century. It is highly significant that this joint consulship was

associated on the coinage with vota decennalia (suscepta). Some scholars have suggested that references to these vota imply that Tetricus celebrated a quinquennalia. However, pace Elmer and others, the chronology of the western emperors precludes any idea of Tetricus getting more than half way through his fourth tribunician year, and even the theory that Tetricus might have chosen to hold his quinquennalian celebrations prematurely is not wholly satisfactory. The idea that Tetricus needed an excuse to reward his troops early in the face of internal political threats and the imminent contest with Aurelian is not unlikely, and may indeed partially account for the vota (and the accompanying donatives) but this does not require there to have been a quinquennalia: the occasion is more likely simply to have been the joint consulship of father and son itself. On any interpretation, the link between the vota and the consulship, in the spirit of standard imperial practice, is decisive.[6]

Once an emperor had determined to hold the consulship, he might also be referred to as consul designatus on coins and inscriptions, in anticipation of its assumption in the following January. Both the senior Licinii and Aurelian are recorded as such.[7] From the moment when an emperor had assumed his first consulship, the title consul was given great prominence in this period both on inscriptions and especially on the coinage. Unless the issue preceded the emperor's first consulship, titular reverse legends would almost always mention the title consul at the least.

Numerous examples of such reverse types exist for Valerian and Gallienus, and several are known for Postumus, Victorinus, Tetricus and Aurelian.[8] Occasionally some of these titles, notably consul, were appended to otherwise unconnected reverse legends.[9]

Although down to the early third century, following the example of Augustus, the assumption of the title pater patriae had often been deferred (sometimes indefinitely), from the reign of Maximinus (235-8) it became standard practice to assume it immediately upon accession. Material evidence for our period shows that the emperors of this period in fact assumed all the relevant standard titles immediately upon being acclaimed emperor.[10] This might be some significant time prior to their recognition by the senate; indeed, as we can see in the case of the western emperors, they might never receive that recognition at all.

One point, however, is already abundantly clear from the standard titulature we have reviewed so far, namely the extent to which the principal elements of the titulature of the western emperors, as represented on their coins and inscriptions, conforms to the standard pattern. Laelian, it is true, provides a slight deviation from the usual titulature, in that his earliest antoniniani lack the title Augustus. We are unlikely ever to know the reason for this omission, and its significance must remain unclear. Other than this, his use of the primary titles

is canonical, as is that of Marius. We are not in a position to judge their use of the secondary standard titulature, since neither produced reverse legends of a titular kind and no inscriptions survive for either.[11] In general, the conformity of the western emperors is remarkable. The correlation is not confined to the choice of titles alone, but extends also to how they are presented: the order of the titles on the inscriptions and coins is canonical; the choice of which titles are placed on the obverse, which on the reverse of the coinage, and in what arrangements, is the same; the obverse legend is shortened precisely according to the standard pattern; the numerical tallies are calculated in the traditional fashion.[12]

ii) Other elements of the standard titulature

In addition to the standard titles mentioned above, a few titles quite regularly make an appearance in the titulature of this period and have a regulated place within this general arrangement. These titles do not fit precisely into the above pattern and their use is somewhat more intermittent. Nevertheless, their frequency and the degree of their integration within the standard titulature is such as to require us to treat them alongside those we have already mentioned. They are dominus noster, invictus, the various cognomina victoriarum and the acclamation imperator. All are found on the inscriptions,

all but the acclamation Imperator on the papyri; on the coinage, only the last two are found in the normal way, and even then not often.

In the third century, the title dominus noster was a firmly established part of the imperial titulature on inscriptions, and the Greek form (ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν) had been regularly used, for example in papyri, from a much earlier date. The title was never, however, as widely used in the western provinces as in the east. Its location within the imperial titulature is almost invariably at the very beginning.[13] It is attested on a few inscriptions for Postumus, but is found for neither Victorinus nor Tetricus. Given the paucity of surviving inscriptions for these emperors, it seems reasonable to conjecture that it was applied to them also, but that no examples survive. This is lent further credence by the use of this title on a single inscription for Tetricus II.[14]

The epithet invictus (Greek: ἀνίκητος or ἀήττητος) had had a long association with Hellenistic rulership stretching back to Alexander the Great. As such it was a concept that had many times been associated with imperial authority in literary contexts. It was first introduced on imperial coinage during the civil war between Pescennius Niger and Septimius Severus, and began to be used as an imperial title from the early third century. By this date the epithet had acquired divine connections beyond those associated with the deified king of Macedon:

it had become a recognized epithet of Hercules, of Mars and, above all, of Sol. From the reign of Gordian III the imperial title Invictus took a settled place in the standard epigraphic titulature, usually lying between Pius Felix and Augustus, though it never became as common as these. Its position in the epigraphic titulature might suggest it should be found on coin obverses; in our evidence, however, it makes no appearance here except for Aurelian (see below, 3b). The verbal symbolism created by the juxtaposition of these titles suggests an emperor who is not only "undefeated" but "invincible" because he is blessed with the divinely inspired luck that his piety towards the gods has earned him. This symbolism played a central role in the representation of imperial authority during this period.[15]

The imperial title Invictus (or its Greek equivalents) is attested in many inscriptions and papyri of Gallienus, both alongside Pius Felix and alone, and for Aurelian also with even greater insistency. By the middle of the third century the association of this title with the cult of Sol Invictus had come to dominate, and this insistency is almost certainly a reflection of the strong association between these emperors and Sol.[16] The triple title Pius Felix Invictus also appears on a large proportion of the extant inscriptions for the western emperors.[17]

The hitherto sporadic use of cognomina victoriarum became a fairly standard feature of imperial titulature

from the reign of Marcus, from which time also they tended to acquire the suffix maximus, with which they are almost invariably associated in the mid-third century. The accumulation of such titles and the frequency with which they are paraded on the inscriptions of third century emperors could be impressive. The standard arrangement for victory cognomina on the inscriptions was between pontifex maximus and the tribunician power, but on papyri and on some Greek inscriptions they follow directly after the emperor's personal names. Where the various cognomina victoriarum were recorded on the coinage, the standard format was for them to appear on the reverse, each victory title having one reverse type all to itself. Just as with the tribunician power and the consulship, the repeated accumulations of the same victory congnomen were enumerated.

The most commonly cited example in this period was Germanicus Maximus. Gallienus is frequently accorded it on inscriptions and papyri throughout his fifteen-year reign. The title also appears on his coinage. During the joint reign, coins were minted for both emperors with the reverse GERMANICVS MAX TER at Rome, and later for Gallienus alone as GERMANICVS MAX V at the Gallic mint. These reverse types cease with the loss of that mint to Postumus and are not repeated at other mints even though the inscriptions persist, albeit somewhat less frequently, during the sole reign.[18] Two other titles of this kind are attested on the inscriptions of Gallienus: Dacicus

Maximus and later Parthicus or Persicus Maximus. There can be no doubt that Parthicus and Persicus are interchangeable versions of what is essentially the same title; that is, that they celebrated the same event.[19] Postumus too was hailed as Germanicus Maximus on both coins and inscriptions, but he was the only one of the western emperors to receive this title. The absence of other cognomina victoriarum for the western emperors is perhaps not surprising, given their geographical location and their preoccupation with the Rhine frontier.[20]

The importance of such victory titles for Aurelian can be inferred from the insistence with which they appear in the material evidence of his reign: even the comparatively laconic titulature used in the papyri and ostraca make use of them surprisingly often. No emperor since Caracalla had received (let alone earned) so many victory cognomina as Aurelian managed to accumulate. Scholars have traditionally divided these between "official" and "unofficial", but the distinction is somewhat problematic. The four so-called "official" titles - Germanicus Maximus, Gothicus Maximus, Parthicus Maximus and Carpicus Maximus - are certainly better attested than any others, and are in fact the only ones to appear in the papyri and ostraca. This is not, however, conclusive evidence for "official" status, especially as the format in which they appear is far from uniform and the evidence often attests other such titles alongside some of these four.[21]

Of the other cognomina victoriarum mentioned in the material evidence, Persicus Maximus, as we saw above, is to be understood as an alternative form for Parthicus. Similarly, Arabicus Maximus (attested on two inscriptions) is almost certainly the equivalent of Palmyrenicus Maximus (attested on one). There is no doubt, however, that this latter pair does not equate to Parthicus/Persicus, as some have tried to suggest, since on one inscription Arabicus and Persicus appear together. In all probability the Persians whom Aurelian is credited with defeating were (at least reputedly) a contingent that had come to the aid of Palmyra. By presenting the Palmyrenes as the allies of the Persians, Aurelian was able to claim the far more glorious and resonant title of Parthicus (Persicus).[22]

Of the remaining victory titles possibly attested for Aurelian - Dacicus Maximus, Sarmaticus Maximus and Britannicus Maximus - Dacicus at least is secure. No major campaign beyond the Danube is known for Aurelian, but the title most likely refers to the defence of the region against the incursions of transdanubian tribes. The two other titles of this kind sometimes ascribed to Aurelian on the basis of the material evidence are rather less secure.[23] In addition to Sarmaticus and three of the four "official" titles, the Historia Augusta attributes two other such titles to Aurelian that are without support in the material evidence: Armeniacus and Adiabenicus. Although these are probably fictions, we should perhaps keep an open mind.[24]

The acclamation Imperator is to be distinguished from the praenomen imperatoris not only by its position in the titulature (usually between tribunicia potestas and consul), but also by the iteration which often accompanies it. On the coinage it is included among the secondary titles on certain titular reverses. As with the victory cognomina, the enumeration helped to stress the stability and efficacy of the emperor's reign in this troubled period. There is some evidence to suggest that the enumeration of this title may sometimes have been reckoned annually, perhaps along with the tribunician power or calculated from the dies imperii, but there is good reason to suppose that at least some of the examples record actual military victory salutations in the original sense of the title. It is very rare to find this title in its acclamatory form in Greek epigraphy.[25]

3.b The Sporadic Titulature

1) Non-standard uses of standard titles

In an interesting departure from standard practice, certain exceptional obverse legends minted for Gallienus include verbal references to titles that are normally reserved for the reverse. Obverse legends employing a variety of abbreviations make reference to his title that Germanicus Maximus were issued at several mints in both

the joint and the sole reign. In addition, COS V is also found on certain obverse types of the sole reign.[26] The extra emphasis granted to these titles, especially to Germanicus Maximus, in this way is an example of the general tendency towards hyperbole in the titulature of the period.

An example of innovation in obverse titulature in addition to those mentioned earlier for Gallienus, can be seen in the inclusion of the title Invictus on certain obverses for Aurelian. A few rare coins of Septimius place this title on the obverse; but appart from these Severan examples (with the possible, though dubious, exception of a single coin of Claudius II of rough workmanship and with the impossible reverse legend COS III) these Aurelianic coins are without precedent in their transposition of this title to the obverse.[27]

ii) Restorer and saviour

The title RESTITVTOR GALLIARVM is attested for Gallienus on coins minted during the joint reign at the Gallic mint. After the loss of the Gallic provinces to Postumus, the title makes no further appearance in the Gallienic corpus; it does, however, reappear for Postumus and again for Victorinus. The iconography associated with these titles on the coin reverses of the western emperors matches that previously used for Gallienus. In this iconography, which we might term the standard "restitutor" type, the emperor

is shown raising a kneeling female figure, in this case intended to represent Gallia wearing a mural crown. An inscription from Narbonensis has recently been restored to reveal the title applied to Aurelian also.[28]

Gallienus and his father were each acclaimed as RESTITVT(or) ORIENTIS on coins minted in the east. For a short time after his father's capture the legend continued for Gallienus, but it made no reappearance once the revolt of Macrianus and Quietus had been put down.[29] Not surprisingly the title is not known for the western emperors, but it played a significant role in the symbolic representation of Aurelian's authority during his Palmyrene campaigns, and even began to be minted in anticipation of the outcome of these as early as the winter of 271-2 while he was mustering his forces for the first campaign (see Appendix, table A:2).

Valerian was hailed as RESTITVTOR ORBIS; the first time this title had appeared in the numismatic record since the reign of Hadrian. Although the same reverse type, depicting the standard restitutor iconography, appears on coins minted for Gallienus, these are probably hybrids.[30] More or less the same type is known for Postumus.[31] It was not until the sole reign that Gallienus was definitively credited with the title in his own right, and even then only two instances are known.[32] It is Aurelian, however, who really made this title his own. From the moment of his initial victory over Palmyra and the

reintegration of the eastern provinces, restitutor orbis quickly became one of Aurelian's most advertised titles. For a while in the middle of his reign, RESTITVTOR ORBIS became the commonest reverse coin legend in use at the various mints operating for Aurelian at that time, and it remained one of the principal types for the rest of his reign.[33] The title is also attested on numerous inscriptions, including one at Rome.[34]

For Gallienus and Aurelian in particular, variations on the theme of "Restorer of the World" are also conveyed by several other titles, some of them apparently new to imperial titulature: among the others we find RESTITVT(or) GENER(is) HVMANI for Valerian and Gallienus; the similar RESTITVTORI GENTIS and RESTITVT(or) SAECVLI for Aurelian.[35] On another coin type Aurelian is declared to be RESTITVTOR EXERCITI, perhaps a reference to improved morale under his leadership. On these coins Mars, as the symbolic embodiment of military might, is depicted offering the emperor a globe, symbolizing the power which the newly invigorated army was entrusting to the emperor.[36] On one inscription Valerian is hailed as restitutor publice saecuritatis ac libertatis conservator, and on another Gallienus is protector imperii Romani omniumque salutis auctor; elsewhere Gallienus is hailed as conservator pietatis.[37] A recently discovered inscription for Aurelian from Gaul may supply another title of this kind: the titulature includes the letters IIPRL, interpreted as denoting I(ndulgentissimus) I(nvictissimus)

P(rinceps) R(estitutor) L(ibertatis).[38] Victorinus is accorded the novel title of DEFENSOR ORBIS on his coins.[39] A medallion of Gallienus addresses him as CONSERVATORI ORBIS, a theme echoed on another which reads (obv.) GALLIENVM AVG PR, (rev.) OB CONSERVATIONEM PATRIAE.[40] Conservator Orbis is also recorded for Aurelian on an inscription from northern Italy, and several other variations on this theme are recorded for him elsewhere.[41] This entire group of titles representing the emperor as restorer and saviour, which made such a strong showing in the Latin sources, is much less common in Greek documents: there are in fact only two possible surviving examples for these reigns, one for Gallienus and one, from Andros, which can only tentatively be assigned to Aurelian.[42]

Thematically connected with the notion of restoration of the empire through military victory is the title pacator orbis, first attested as an imperial title for Commodus. It appears on the reverse of coins minted in the names of Valerian and Gallienus depicting Jupiter (or the emperor as Jupiter). The same title is found on coins for Postumus, though in this case it is not the Licinian, but a Severan prototype which was copied.[43] It may be significant that all the instances of this title from the reign of Aurelian occur in sources of Gallic origin. On Aurelian's inscriptions the title is coupled with restitutor orbis. These inscriptions date from late in the reign, and most likely post-date the reintegration of Gaul, although it is impossible to tell precisely enough

from internal evidence or from their location (since both examples come from Narbonensis).[44] The novel title PACATOR ORIENTIS is also briefly mentioned on the reverse of rare coins minted for Aurelian after the first Palmyrene campaign.[45] Certain inscriptions from North Africa also grant Aurelian the novel title pacatissimus imperator, again stressing the role of the emperor as the provider of peace.[46]

iii) Formulaic and exaggerated titles

Much of the sporadic titulature is concentrated upon the victorious nature of the emperor's reign. This is especially true for Aurelian, who received the title victoriosus.[47] As well as the usual victory acclamations and other more involved uses of the title imperator, Aurelian is referred to on one inscription as imperator horientis (sic), a reference to his victories over Palmyra.[48] Another title with strong military connotations attested on coins and inscriptions for Aurelian and for Gallienus is princeps iuventutis. The application of this title to Augusti is very rare; normally it was reserved for Caesars (see below, 3.d).[49]

One class of sporadic titulature occasionally attested on inscriptions for emperors of the third century makes use of superlative adjectives or other similar inflated language, often arranged in formulary patterns. Many such formulae, which are sometimes quite involved, date back to

the early third century, where several examples are known for Septimius and Caracalla, though certain examples represent new improvements on these old themes. For Gallienus we find the title victoriosissimus on a couple of inscriptions, and several more involved formulae are also known both for him and for Valerian.[50] Gallienus is called clementissimus princeps and, in imitation of Trajan, optimus princeps; he and Valerian are jointly referred to as nobilissimi principes nostri.[51]

Though such formulae are generally fairly sporadic in most reigns, their use for Aurelian is outstandingly prolific. Many of the same individual elements within these formulary titles turn up again and again in different combinations. Among the more frequent of those recorded for Aurelian are gloriosissimus, fortissimus, indulgentissimus, victoriosissimus and the somewhat tautologous invictissimus.[52] On one such inscription Aurelian is styled both magnus Augustus and princeps maximus, a combination of titles that is testament to the general inflationary tendency of titulature in this period.[53] In addition to his many individual acclamations as imperator, Aurelian was also acclaimed with the unprecedented title perpetuus imperator on a good many of the inscriptions which carry these formulae. The title perpetuus imperator, the semantic connotations of which prefigure the fourth century semper triumphator, is also known from other inscriptions of this "most victorious" emperor. It is striking to note that, with one exception,

all the inscriptions that bear this title for Aurelian are from North Africa.[54]

An unprecedented coin type from the sole reign gives Gallienus the title RECTOR ORBIS, depicting the laureate emperor standing naked, holding the long sceptre in one hand and the globe in the other: that is, a representation of the emperor with the attributes of Jupiter. The same title is repeated on an inscription from Falerii, accompanied by the extra title dominus terrarum, and a Greek equivalent is also attested on an inscription from Thrace.[55] Similarly Valerian and Gallienus are given an even more sweeping title, once again borrowed from Severan titulature: lord of the land the sea and the people of the world. A shorter version of this title is also found on an inscription for Valerian and a similar title is attested for Aurelian.[56]

iv) Titles suggesting divine or quasi-divine status

Just as the title Invictus was associated with Alexander the Great, the double title Magnus et Invictus, recorded on a few inscriptions for Gallienus and Aurelian, was doubly significant as an element of imperial imitatio Alexandri.[57] Valerian and Gallienus were also styled μέγιστος καὶ θειότατος, and on a recently discovered statue base, which once held a statue of Aurelian, this emperor is accorded the same title.[58] The quasi-sacral nature of imperial authority, implicit in the title

Augustus itself, was heightened by the application of the terms sanctus, sacer and their respective cognates to the emperor and to matters imperial. In view of the general tendency to inflation of titulature in this period, it is not surprising to find references to Gallienus and to Aurelian as sanctissimus.[59]

The worship of a reigning emperor as divine was a matter of course in the Greek-speaking area of the empire, where (from the time of Augustus) the Sebastoi, collectively or individually, whether living or dead, were worshipped as theoi; the distinction drawn in Latin between deus and divus is not reflected in Greek terminology. For this reason it is not always easy to tell whether references to an emperor as θεός, such as are occasionally found for Gallienus and Aurelian, were posthumous or not.[60] Aurelian was honoured with senatorial consecratio, but Gallienus was not. The western emperor Victorinus was also honoured as DIVO VICTORINO PIO on posthumous coins issue early in the reign of Tetricus.[61] Senatorial decrees and confusions over the translation of the term divus into Greek do not, however, help to explain the existence of several inscriptions from the Latin West (Italy, Spain and North Africa) which refer to deo Aureliano, in addition to those which call him divus. Whether these inscriptions were put up in his lifetime or were in fact posthumous is impossible to say for certain.[62]

The material sources do, however, provide us with unequivocal evidence that Aurelian was indeed given the title deus in his lifetime: certain coins minted towards the end of his reign with the obverse legends IMP DEO ET DOMINO AVRELIANO AVG and DEO ET DOMINO NATO AVRELIANO AVG.[63] These coin types are the most striking example of innovative obverse titulature, and quite without precedent in imperial coinage. The use of dominus as an imperial title was nothing new, as we have seen, and in the late first century Domitian had wished to be styled dominus et deus noster, but these titles as such had never before appeared on imperial coinage for a reigning emperor. The use of the dative case is extremely rare in obverse titulature, though other instances are known in our period. Moreover, the coins themselves are rare and were only produced at Serdica, a mint set up by Aurelian and responsible for a good many of the more unusual coins of his reign. These points render the significance of these coins difficult to assess.[64]

3.c Imperial Insignia, Dress and Attributes

1) Insignia and dress

In the standard obverse iconography of the mid-third century the emperor is sometimes depicted in a toga or, more often, in a cuirass; the paludamentum, the military

cloak symbolizing his imperium, is often shown over his armour in the latter case. Though of a different origin, this cloak was by this time almost certainly identical with the imperial purple, a particularly important insigne.[65] During the reigns with which we are concerned, the military style predominated, and indeed in the case of Aurelian almost exclusively so.

For headgear, the emperor is usually depicted wearing either the laurel wreath or the radiate crown. The laurels had been an emblem of victory (and indeed associated with the triumph) since the republic, and had been consistently displayed as an element of imperial insignia since the time of Augustus (and indeed had been occasionally used in Hellenistic royal portraiture prior to that). The emperor was frequently depicted laureate in reverse iconography also; on many occasions, particularly those associated most directly with the notion of imperial victory, the emperor is shown in the act of crowning (a trophy) or being crowned (by Victoria) with this imperial emblem.[66] The oak wreath had also been used in Hellenistic ruler portraiture, but the Roman imperial use was more directly connected to the corona civica, which had been an integral part of imperial symbolism since the reign of Augustus. Though it does not appear as imperial headgear on obverse coin portraits of the mid-third century, the Augustan symbolism is reflected in the clipeus-style reverse legends.[67]

The use of the diadem as imperial headgear in the mid-third century raises a number of problems concerning the term "diadem" itself. Many different fillets were worn as headgear in the ancient portraiture, for example by victorious athletes. In this form it is attested in third century imperial sculture, as in the colossal statue of Severus Alexander now in the Naples Museum. An oblique reference to <u>imitatio Alexandri</u> is implied in this sculpture, no doubt, just as in this emperor's cognomen. Nevertheless what he wears is not that very specific item of Hellenistic regalia for which the term "diadem" should rightly be reserved. There is, in fact, no known example of portraits in which a Roman emperor is unquestionably depicted wearing this precise symbolic headgear. Three factors complicate the matter. First, the headgear that Constantine adopted in the early fourth century was termed a "diadem" by contemporaries and is still so termed today; although presumably modelled on the Hellenistic diadem, Constantine's headgear is none the less quite distinct from the Hellenistic emblem of kingship. Secondly, there are reports in the literary testimony that Aurelian was the first Roman emperor to wear a diadem, along with splendidly bejewelled attire. From the context it is clear that a forerunner of the Constantinian headgear and not a revival of the Hellenistic one was meant, but it is difficult to judge how far the testimony can be trusted. Thirdly, the situation is further confused by the

conventional numismatic use of the term "diadem" to refer to the headgear worn by imperial women at this date.[68]

In the material evidence with which we are concerned here, only one instance exists of an emperor wearing something that could be thought to resemble a "diadem": on a medallion issued for Gallienus the emperor appears bare-headed except for a small band or fillet, only visible at the back of his head, which is tied at the nape. Whatever this portrait may have been intended to convey, the die cutter was evidently in two minds. To load this unique specimen with the interpretation of the first numismatic depiction of "the diadem" is patently going too far, and going beyond this to infer ideas about Gallienus' political programme is simply to indulge in idle speculation.[69]

The coinage occasionally represents the emperor with insignia and dress suggesting certain important offices mentioned in his titulature. Reverse types are known showing the emperor, capite velato, in the act of sacrificing to the gods. The iconography, which probably depicts the emperor in his capacity as Pontifex Maximus, served to stress the emperor's piety.[70] In a similar fashion the emperor is represented in his capacity as consul on certain specific reverse types of this period. Here he is usually depicted in consular robes seated in the curule chair holding a globe and sceptre. Such

reverses are attested for Valerian and Gallienus as well as for Postumus and Tetricus.[71]

An interesting variation of this iconography appears on a gold coin type for Postumus with the reverse INDVLG PIA POSTVMI AVG, depicting the emperor seated in majesty on a sella curulis while a diminutive figure, a subject or a captive, kneels before him ~~and~~ with both arms raised, presumably bowing down before the emperor. This may be the earliest depiction in any artistic medium of deep obeisance before a Roman emperor, representing some form of imperial adoratio twenty years before Diocletian.[72] In addition, the emperor is iconographically represented as consul on certain rare coin obverses, again wearing the trabea and sometimes carrying a globe and sceptre. Coins of this type are known for Valerian, Gallienus and Aurelian.[73] This iconographic representation is also to be found on several types for the Tetrici minted in honour of their joint consulship in 274: on some the two emperors are shown together, on others just the son alone.[74]

The sceptre and the globe were emblems of political authority which had been associated with imperial authority for a long time. Both are found on certain obverses of Gallienus and Aurelian, and both are regularly found in the reverse iconographic representations of these emperors. The globe indicated world dominion (and as such is often associated in Roman art with Dea Roma); it was also an attribute of Sol. It is found associated with the

emperor on several coin reverses, especially in scenes depicting divine aid or divine investiture.[75]

The emperor is often shown in reverse iconography holding a spear, symbolic of his role as defender of the empire. In place of, or in addition to, the spear, certain reverses also depict the emperor with military standards, emphasizing the close ties that needed to exist between the emperor and his armies.[76] More significant are those obverse portrait types in which the emperor is shown armed. Besides the standard cuirassed portraits, certain obverse types represent the emperor carrying either a spear or a shield, or sometimes both. Such types are known for Gallienus from the joint as well as from the sole reign and also for Postumus, Victorinus, and Tetricus.[77] On one level these coin types represent the emperor simply as the provider of military protection for the empire through his victorious rule. On another level, however, they may also hint at a more far-reaching symbolism, in which the emperor is represented, if not precisely as an incarnation of the god Mars, then at least as his earthly counterpart and companion-at-arms.[78]

ii) Divine attributes

One example where the association between the emperor and Mars is taken a step further can be seen on the obverse of a few rare antoniniani for Aurelian where, in addition to the emperor carrying the weapons mentioned

above, he is depicted in heroic nudity. These coins suggest that the emperor was god-like in his role as protector of the empire, and the deity to whom he most nearly approximates is Mars.[79] The close association, or even identification, between the emperor and Mars is made even more clear on certain other coins of this period on which the emperor is portrayed wearing a helmet (usually in addition to his other weapons). These helmeted obverse portraits, though never common, are to be found most frequently for Gallienus; several are also known for Postumus and a few for Victorinus. More rarely still, such helmeted busts are to be found as coin reverses also.[80] On certain of the helmeted types this identification is made more explicit through the use of a distinctive, elaborately decorated helmet of a classical Greek style, which is worn elsewhere on this coinage by divine beings, notably Mars.[81] The close relationship between imperial virtus and Mars implied on these coins, central to the imperial ideology of the day, will be discussed more fully in the next chapter (below, 4.b).

Gallienus is identified with Hercules in obverse portrait types which show the emperor with a club over his shoulder or wearing the Nemean lion pelt over his head.[82] Postumus is also similarly portrayed in the guise of Hercules. In the case of Gallienus, the divine identification is one among several; the iconographic portrayal of Postumus' special relationship with Hercules on his coinage, of which the obverse types referred to

were but a small fraction, went far further.[83] Certain of the portraits where the emperor wears the lion pelt are especially interesting, since they imitate the obverse of the Herakles tetradrachm types minted in the name of Alexander the Great and subsequent types for other Hellenistic kings. This aspect of imitatio Alexandri was first introduced to imperial obverse iconography under Commodus who, like Alexander before him, claimed a special relationship with Hercules. Both Alexander and Hercules were archetypes of the mortal who had conquered death through deeds of valour to join the immortals. As with Mars, the identification of the emperor and his virtus with Hercules appears to have had a great appeal in the third century.[84]

Another example of the use of insignia to suggest the divine origin of the emperor's victories can be seen in those portrait types which depict the aegis on his armour. This mark of divine power, associated with both Jupiter and Minerva, was certainly well-established as an imperial attribute by the mid-third century. It can clearly be seen on certain obverse portraits of Gallienus. It has also been suggested that the small, usually tear-shaped device on the shoulder of most of Aurelian's obverse portraits represents a highly stylized rendition of the aegis, though this remains unproven. However there can be no doubt that the gorgoneion, iconographically associated with the aegis, appears occasionally on both the shield and the cuirass in certain Aurelianic obverse portraits.[85]

Both the long sceptre (with which the emperor is shown on certain reverses) and the eagle-topped short sceptre (with which he is occasionally shown in both reverse and obverse iconography) had associations with Jupiter, and these insignia therefore likewise imply the divine guarantee of imperial success.[86]

Certain coins obverse portraits of Gallienus depict the emperor as Mercury, naked but for a cloak, carrying a caduceus over his shoulder.[87] Mercury was closely associated with trade in the ancient world. For this reason, besides indicating the assimilation of the emperor to the deity, these coin portraits may also suggest the benefits of the emperor's care of the empire. However, the precise significance of this association between the emperor and Mercury, which dates back to the reign of Augustus, is too intricate to permit any single interpretation. The same iconographic representation is also found for Aurelian, though in this case they are only known on antoniniani.[88]

A particularly remarkable, and as yet not fully explained, series of obverse types minted at Rome in approximately AD 266 and echoed at Siscia, perhaps a little later, apparently bear portraits of Gallienus with the attributes of Demeter (Ceres). On the Roman coins, he wears a crown woven from what appear to be ears of wheat. The iconography shows a marked resemblance to that of Demeter on fourth century BC tetradrachms from Syracuse

and also recalls the "Triptolemos" diadem of Ptolemy IV. The exact interpretion of these coins is in some doubt, but they have most plausibly been connected with Gallienus' initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Roman mint issued reverse types with the legends VICTORIA AVG and VBIQVE PAX. The obverse legends that accompanied these coins included the unique and somewhat curious legend GALLIENAE AVGVSTAE.[89] This may constitute a feminine dative, emphasizing the close association between the emperor and the goddess. However, other explanations have been offered, such as the more prosaic idea that the legend is infact a masculine vocative, or the more far fetched notion that these coins were the work of Gallienus' detractors; though why these "detractors" should have gone to such artistic lengths to produce such cryptic "propaganda", and still more how they could have gained access to the mints, are quite unanswerable questions.[89a] Three aurei minted at Siscia with reverse legends FIDES MIL, MARTI PROPVNATORI (sic) and PM TRP VII COS PP are accompanied by obverse portrait busts which recall the GALLIENAE AVGVSTAE types from Rome.[90]

Rays emanating from the head had long been associated with the concept of godhead in the ancient Mediterranean, and for centuries this symbolism had been particularly associated with the solar deities Sol/Helios and Apollo. Through its associations with divinity, and especially solar divinity, the radiate crown formed part of the imagery associated with the divinization of Alexander. In

this way his Hellenistic successors came to wear radiate diadems. This imagery was increasingly taken over into imperial iconography, most obviously in the form of the standard radiate crown. A form of radiate crown had been used on first century imperial coinage, where it had been associated very strongly with the imperial <u>divi</u>, as a symbol of their divinization. Although somewhat weakened by its denominational function, the divine and indeed expressly solar associations of the radiate crown persisted throughout the third century.[91]

On certain laureate obverses of Postumus thin rays are shown in addition to the laurel crown. These clearly represent some form of radiate crown, similar to that he wears without the laurels on another obverse (E.538), which more closely resembles the crown of Sol than the common imperial radiate of this period, implying a more intimate identity between the emperor and the god.[92] On another coin obverse type, Postumus is shown with his hand raised in salutation; similar types are also known both for Gallienus and for Aurelian. Here again the iconography was probably intended (albeit somewhat obliquely) to suggest solar affiliations, since the same raised hand is common in representations of the sun-god, for example in the depictions of Sol (or the emperor as Sol) in reverse iconography.[93]

Finally we should not overlook a highly controversial set of obverse portraits, which have been placed in

various different contexts, including the suggestion that they be dated to the interregnum of 275, but which on grounds of metal content and style must certainly date from the latter part of Gallienus' sole reign. These unique bronze coins, bearing the obverse legend GENIVS P R, have received several interpretations. The obverse portrait is of Genius Populi Romani, usually wearing a mural crown, sometimes radiate (of denominational significance again). Although the bust is always clean-shaven, its features bear an unmistakable likeness to Gallienus in a sizeable proportion of the extant examples. Göbl had no doubts concerning the intentional identity of the emperor with the genius and dated the coins to the new year, AD 266, in which Gallienus took up his seventh consulship having returned from his tour of Greece. The curious reverse, INT/VRB SIC (intravit urbem, or perhaps more likely intrata urbe), may refer to the occasion of his imperial adventus into Rome. More recently Younge has questioned the intentionality of the Gallienic features and places the coin at the very end of the reign after the news of the battle of Naissus (which he places in 268 before Gallienus' death) had reached Rome. Whether the approximation of Gallienus to Genius Populi Romani was intentional or not, the symbolic association was still present.[94]

3.d Titles and Insignia of Consorts and Princes

i) The Augustae

In the representation of imperial authority in the Roman empire of the third century the part played by the imperial women was not insignificant. This was to a great extent a legacy of the powerful role enjoyed by the women of the Severan dynasty in the early decades of the century. The two empresses with which we are chiefly concerned, Salonina and Severina, the consorts of Gallienus and Aurelian respectively, were no exceptions in this. In their standard obverse titulature the only title recorded is Augusta. The only coinage minted for imperial women during these reigns which deviated from this was the posthumous coinage for Mariniana, Valerian's wife and the mother of Gallienus, which bears the obverse legend DIVAE MARINIANAE.[95]

In terms of insignia and other iconographic traits, the obverse busts of the empresses are very conservative, compared to those used for the emperors. It had long since become a standard feature of the coin portraits of Roman empresses to show them wearing the stephane, an element of regalia adopted from Hellenistic royal women. Both Salonina and Severina are regularly so portrayed on the obverse of the coinage minted in their names. It is unfortunate that this headgear has conventionally come to be referred to in numismatic texts as a "diadem": while it

is true that it resembles what is generally meant today by the term "diadem", it is strongly to be distingulshed from the true diadem, the Hellenistic royal headband tied at the nape. This confusion aside, the stephane does none the less represent an important association between the imperial house and the images of Hellenistic royalty. On those denominations where the emperors would wear the radiate crown, a crescent moon is placed under the obverse bust of the empress. The double solar/lunar symbolism thus created dates from the coinage of Septimius and Julia Domna in the early third century.[96]

The titulature for the imperial women preserved in the epigraphic record provides a rather greater variety of titles; most of these are variants of titles their husbands bore. Here they are also called Augusta/Σεβαστή, and in one particular case Salonina is given both forms of the title on the same inscription.[97] Both Salonina and Severina are regularly represented in terms of their relation to the the emperor, most often in the formula coniunx domini nostri.[98] Both also held a title which expressed their relationship with the imperial armies, mater castrorum. This title had been applied to imperial women fairly regularly since it was given to Faustina by Marcus Aurelius a century earlier. An expansive variation, first used for the imperial women of the Severan dynasty, was applied to Severina: mater castrorum et senatus et patriae. This longer version mirrors the associations of the imperial title pater patriae.[99] On

rare occasions both Salonina and Severina are referred to as domina or its Greek equivalent.[100]

Like their imperial husbands, these two empresses also received titles which are couched in the form of superlatives. Salonina is granted the title of sanctissima on several inscriptions; Severina is both sanctissima and plissima.[101] Severina is given the title ἐπιφανέστατη, a title more usually reserved for young princes of the purple, and Salonina is sometimes accorded the title θεοφιλέστατη, which again is more usually associated with her children (see below).[102] One remarkable inscription from Thrace is dedicated to Ουλπίαν Σευηρεῖναν Θεὰν Νείκην Σεβαστ[η]ν.[103]

ii) The Caesars

The titulature of the young princes, as that of their mothers, tends to be fairly simple on the coinage, while retaining a much greater range on the inscriptions. The title Caesar, without the accompanying title Augustus, had been granted to an emperor's son (natural or adopted) or to a political heir presumptive from the time of Hadrian. During the joint reign, Gallienus associated his two sons Valerian and Saloninus each in turn with his authority, and as such each successively received the title of Caesar, often recorded as nobilissimus caesar on coins and inscriptions. There is no evidence to suggest that Gallienus ever raised either of these youths to the

position of full co-rulership with himself. However, on several occasions each in turn apparently received the title Augustus and the praenomen imperatoris, both titles appropriate only to a full Augustus. These instances occur on inscriptions from Africa and the eastern provinces as well as on papyri. In most cases this can be put down to error or to confusion caused by concision within the document (the latter accounts for most of the papyrological instances). The only instances that cannot be thus explained away are those coins minted in the name of Saloninus Augustus. This coinage was apparently produced while the prince was under attack from Postumus. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Saloninus' adoption of the full titles of an Augustus was ever recognized outside Cologne, where it seems the unfortunate prince was besieged.[104]

The title princeps iuventutis often formed part of the titulature of imperial princes in the third century. It is attested on coins and inscriptions for both Valerian II and Saloninus. In the iconography of such coins the prince is regularly shown armoured holding a spear and sometimes military standards. The implication of this iconography is of a successor in the making being schooled in the arts of war: not only did it associate the young prince with the army but it also helped to promote the idea of his adolescent virtus; indeed the symbolism is strongly reminiscent of certain virtus types issued for their father.[105]

The standard titles appropriate to an imperial prince are likewise attested for Tetricus II. The youth received the titles caesar (coin obverses) or nobilissimus caesar (inscriptions) and princeps iuventutis (both coin reverses and inscriptions). The reverses and even the obverses of certain coins minted for the Tetrici during their joint reign sometimes use the plural of the title Augustus (denoted by AVGG), even though we can be quite certain that Tetricus Junior never personally received the title. This use of the plural form is attested in other such cases in the third century, however. The elevation and titulature of Tetricus Caesar, like that of his father, can thus be seen to follow the usual pattern of imperial tradition.[106] Unlike the sons of Gallienus, Tetricus Junior was elevated to a joint consulship with his father in 274. As we noted above for his father (above, 3.c), his role as consul was reflected in the iconography of certain obverse types minted at the time. The title consul is also mentioned on an inscription for Tetricus II.[107] Both the Licinian princes and Tetricus Junior are also enjoy the imperial title dominus noster or its equivalent.[108]

In addition to the standard titulature we have seen thus far, certain papyri and inscriptions give the two Licinian princes some more exaggerated titles. On several inscriptions one or other of them is referred to as θεοφιλέστατος καῖσαρ.[109] On one inscription from Greece Valerian Junior is given the title ὁσιώτατος καὶ

θειότατος. On certain papyri he is also referred to as ἱερώτατος καῖσαρ (in place of the more usual ἐπιφανέστατος).[110] Valerian Junior was consecrated on his death and subsequently both coin obverses and inscriptions give him the title divus.[111]

Summary, Chapter 3

The most significant feature of the titles and insignia employed for these emperors on their coins and inscriptions was the strongly conservative nature of most of the symbols and the retrospection that naturally accompanies this. There is considerable emphasis on the role of the emperors as restorers and protectors of the empire through their victories. The use the many of the more elaborate titles, insignia and attributes, for both emperors and empresses, can be traced back to the reigns of Commodus and the Severans, and many of these can be seen to have their origins in Hellenistic royal symbolism. Through the use of both titulature and attributes the association of these emperors and their families with the divine is remarkably pronounced. Finally it should be noted that, with respect to the material surveyed thus far, Postumus and his successors in Gaul conform exactly to the model provided by those emperors who were recognized at Rome.

CHAPTER 4

SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATIONS OF IMPERIAL AUTHORITY: II. THE VICTORIOUS EMPEROR AND THE DIVINE

Beyond the symbolism expressed in the titulature and insignia of the imperial family, the material evidence preserves a range of symbolism representing the emperor and his family in ways which helped to enhance and reinforce imperial authority. In this second part of the survey of the material evidence I shall consider this range of symbolism in four parts. First, I shall look at the symbolic relationship between the emperor and the armies whose loyalty was crucial to his authority. Secondly, I shall review the imperial ideology of victory, especially with regard to the emperor's relationship with three deities strongly linked to his military fortunes: Victoria herself, Mars and Hercules. Thirdly, I shall consider the complex symbolism which associated the emperor with the foundation of peace and prosperity, with the mythology of the restoration of the "Golden Age" and with the mythical and historical Roman past. Finally, I shall turn to the symbolic relationship between the emperor and those deities who are represented as most intimately bound up with the tutelage of the imperial destiny of Rome: notably Jupiter, Apollo and Sol.

4.a The Symbolic Ties Between the Emperor and his Armies

The association between the emperor and the Roman armies, which emerged as a theme of the imperial titulature (above, Ch.3.a-b), was carried to great lengths in the coins and inscriptions of the mid-third century. It must be stressed, however, that this theme is central to the symbolic representation of imperial authority from the earliest years of the empire and, while the references to the loyalty of the troops and the symbolic relationship between individual army units and the emperor was given greater prominence in this period, such aspects were not new developments so much as intensifications of existing trends.[1]

Like most other emperors in the mid-third century, the emperors with whom we are here concerned came by their imperial power as a direct or indirect result of armed rebellion. Not surprisingly, therefore, the coinage lays great stress upon the loyalty and support of the armies, expressed by such legends as FIDES MILITVM and CONCORDIA EXERCITVS. Such types were, in fact, among the first minted for Valerian in 253.[2] Analogous legends continued to be a common feature in the coinage of Valerian and Gallienus throughout their reigns. They played an especially prominent role in the coinage minted for Gallienus from the capture of his father to his own decennalia in 262, among which were some that singled out the oaths of loyalty sworn by the Praetorians.[3] One

particular FIDES MILITVM type from the joint reign, minted over a number of issues for Gallienus at his Gallic mint, depicted an eagle on a globe (in place of the more usual personification Fides), between two military standards on the reverse. Essentially the same type was later minted (in gold) for Victorinus also.[4] Indeed this theme is well represented in the coinage of the western emperors in general. A revealing titular reverse type for Tetricus employs the standard Fides iconography, emphasizing the emperor's reliance upon the loyalty of his troops.[5]

The theme of military support is likewise a prominent and more or less constant feature of the coinage of Aurelian's reign.[6] Indeed the concordia types were the only ones to be minted throughout the entire length of the reign, and for a brief while early in the reign they dominated the coinage.[7] By far the commonest reverse legend minted for Severina was CONCORDIAE MILITVM, the last issues of which may possibly, as mentioned earlier, have been produced in the confused and potentially volatile circumstances that followed Aurelian's assassination.[8]

The emperor's relationship with his troops is alluded to on various types depicting imperial adlocutio. These occasions would also have been an excuse for donatives, which presumably explains the existence of such coin types, attested for Valerian and Gallienus and for Postumus.[9] The coinage also pays tribute to the fighting

capability (virtus) of the soldiers, thereby associating the emperor's authority with the military prowess of his armies. In certain cases this association is taken a step further: the VIRT(VS) MILITVM types for Aurelian share the same reverse iconography with certain contemporary VIRTVS AVG types, suggesting a close parallel between the emperor's virtus and that of the soldiers upon whose fighting capacity his victories also depended. The most common iconography of these types depicts Mars - as the personification of Rome's military achievement, and thus to some extent of the Roman army itself - handing a small victory to the emperor. Such types not only express the close relationship acknowledged to exist between the armies and imperial military success, but also stresses the fact that this success is under the tutelage of the gods.[10] A similar parity between the emperor and his crack regiments may have been intended by types minted for Aurelian which refer to the prowess and presiding spirit of Illyricum. Once again it is Mars who is portrayed.[11]

Another example of the parallel between emperor and army is provided by a pair of types minted for Postumus placing the good health of the emperor and of his soldiers respectively under the protection of Aesculapius, using the same iconography in each case. Furthermore, the SALVS AVG (Aesulapius) type from Milan was minted alongside coinage that otherwise exclusively referred to the cavalry. These types may possibly suggest at least the threat of pestilence, of which there was a great deal at

this time (not forgetting that only a few years later Claudius II died of the plague). Equally, however, they may be no more than a reference to, or symbolic prayer for, the general fitness and good health of both the emperor and his troops.[12]

Another aspect of the close association between emperor and army which symbolically bound the troops more closely to the reigning emperor can be seen in the nomenclature of army units. From the end of the second century the practice of naming army units after the emperor responsible for raising them was taken a stage further by the expediency of renaming such units in honour of the reigning emperor. By the early third century this practice of renaming had become widespread, and in our period there are several examples which survive in the epigraphic record. An inscription from the year 254 accords the Praetorian cohorts the cognomen Valeriana Gallena (sic).[13] Four instances of this also appear on inscriptions for the western emperors, all from northern Britain: a cavalry ala is named as Sebussiana Postumiana (though the imperial cognomen was subsequently erased); and the Cohors I Aelia Dacorum is twice recorded as Postumiana and once renamed in honour of Tetricus. Similar associations are also found for Aurelian.[14]

A particular feature of this period is the production of coins which single out an individual army corps for special mention. Among the coins minted at Milan as part

of the special series celebrating Gallienus' decennalia were some with the unprecedented reverse legend FIDEI EQVITVM, marking the first time that the cavalry had been especially singled out on imperial coinage. Gallienus had stationed mobile cavalry units, apparently drawn from a number of army units around the empire, as a strategic reserve at Milan at this time. It is probable that the ALACRITATI type (depicting Pegasus), which is unique to this same issue, was similarly intended as a tribute to the preparedness and fighting capacity of these units.[15] The series of coins minted at Milan by Aureolus in the name of Postumus at the very end of Gallienus' reign refers almost exclusively to these same cavalry units which Gallienus had stationed under Aureolus' command.[16] Special mention for the <u>virtus</u> of the cavalry is again made under Aurelian on coins which depict the emperor on horseback in his role as cavalry commander.[17]

The all-important Praetorians, whose special relationship with the house of Valerian has already been referred to, are cited on gold coins issued at Rome very early in the sole reign of Gallienus; these may have formed part of a donative intended to calm the situation created in the capital by the news of Valerian's capture.[18] The Praetorians are likewise among several army units singled out for "special mention" in the famous legionary issue for Gallienus from the mint of Milan. This remarkable series of coins drew its inspiration from the legionary issue of Septimius Severus, and as with the

original it must have been intended as a donative to ensure the loyalty of the troops at a critical moment. The issue almost certainly represents the first new types to be minted at Milan after the shock of the news from the east.[19]

The makeup of the units mentioned and the significance of the suffixes added to their names poses some interesting questions (see table 4:1 below). The units honoured are not confined to the Rhenish and Danubian legions, as two of the units were stationed in Italy; nor are they simply all the units under Gallienus' direct control: the III Augusta, stationed in Numidia, is absent and some of those which are mentioned were, as such, clearly no longer under Gallienus' control. The most convincing explanation is that the reference is not to whole legions, but to <u>vexillationes</u> withdrawn from the named units and stationed at Milan as a reserve against the anticipated attacks of the Alamanni and, later, of Postumus. If so, it was probably these units which were honoured later under the general label of cavalry (see above). Even this solution, however, does not altogether explain the absence (to date) of the other western legions (the II Augusta, the VI Victrix and the XX Valeria Victrix stationed in Britain, and the VII Gemina in Spain), since vexillations taken from these are also known to have been with Gallienus. Each of these army units is accompanied on the coins by a numeral suffix, given either as V P(ia) V F(idelis), VI P VI F or VII P VII F. These numbers most

likely referred to victories, though this explanation is not without its difficulties, and we are certainly very far from knowing which, if any, victories were meant. Only the predominant suffix "VI P VI F" covers all the military units honoured. It has been suggested, in view of their rarity, that the instances of the suffix "V P V F" are in fact die-cutters' errors, though this remains controversial.[20]

Table 4:1

Legionary issue of Gallienus at Milan, 260-61
showing the geographical distribution
of the army units mentioned

Reverse leg./ Army unit	Location of permanent camp	Reverse iconography/emblem: (Principal)	(Subsidiary)
COHH PRAET	(Rome)	Radiate lion	
LEG II PART	(Italy)	Centaur	
LEG I ITAL	(Moesia Inf.)	Boar	Taurocamp
LEG XI CL	"	Neptune	Boar
LEG IIII FL	(Moesia Sup.)	Lion	
LEG VII CL	"	Bull	
LEG V MAC	(Dacia)	Victoria + eagle	
LEG XIII GEM	"	Victoria + lion	
LEG I ADI	(Pannonia Inf.)	Capricorn	Pegasus
LEG II ADI	"	Bull	Pegasus
LEG X GEM	(Pannonia Sup.)	Bull	
LEG XIIII GEM	"	Capricorn	
LEG II ITAL	(Noricum)	Wolf & twins	Capricorn
LEG III ITAL	(Raetia)	Stork	
LEG VIII AVG	(Germania Sup.)	Bull	
LEG XXII	"	Capricorn	
LEG I MIN	(Germania Inf.)	Minerva	
LEG XXX VLP	"	Neptune	

NOTE: For the distribution of the suffixes V P V F, VI P VI F, VII P VII F, see King, C. (1984), 120-25.

Gallienus' legionary series was, in its turn, the inspiration behind another such series: the legionary aurei minted for Victorinus with two obverse types and a range of reverses. Almost certainly the reference is once again to detachments under Victorinus' control rather than to the whole legions, since in this case also the legions represented were stationed all over the empire.[21] A type minted for Laelian, depicting a female figure (Germania?) holding a spear and a standard on which is inscribed XXX, almost certainly refers to the Legio XXX Ulpia Victrix, stationed at Xanten; but again a detatchment of this legion, perhaps stationed at Mainz, may have been meant.[22]

The strong symbolic association between the emperor and his armies expressed in the coins and inscriptions surveyed here stresses not only the emperor's role as supreme commander but also the crucial importance of the loyalty of the armies in this period of political instability. In this context the two "legionary issues", for Gallienus and Victorinus respectively, are especially noteworthy. The renaming of army units in honour of the reigning emperor symbolically represented the emperor as the individual responsible for raising the unit concerned, a relationship which bound such units closely to the emperor. In a similar fashion, the strong showing of the legend CONCORDIAE MILITVM for Severina recalls her title of mater castrorum. The representation of the emperor as supreme commander of the armies, the significance of which has already been noted with regard to imperial titulature

(above, Ch.3.a-b), is inextricably linked to the most central symbolic theme in the representation of imperial authority, namely the emperor's success in military affairs.

4.b The Divine Inspiration of Imperial Victory

i) The victorious emperor and the goddess Victoria

The central importance within the scheme of imperial ideology of the representation of the emperor as essentially victorious and of imperial victory as divinely ordained, what Gagé termed "the theology of victory", is a widely accepted view. Without the support of the gods, which he earned through his piety, the emperor could not expect to be victorious; conversely his victoriousness was itself a testament to the favour of the gods, and with this favour he was invincible. It has been argued that the imperial theology of victory underwent a serious change in the third century away from victory as a military reality towards a more ethereal notion of victory. Certainly the notion of eternal victory, which we find expressed in this evidence, implies not only a strong element of divine guarantee, but also a timeless and arguably abstract quality to the notion of victory, linking the emperor's victoriousness to the destiny of eternal Rome. We must recognize, however, that in this

period victory was celebrated both as an abstract concept and as a real event. The two are complementary, and more often than not both were meant simultaneously, even if the "real victories" were sometimes, as we can better perceive with hindsight, of negligible strategic importance.[23]

As one of the most crucial aspects of the representation of imperial authority at this time, imperial victory was alluded to on inscriptions and was a constant theme of the coinage. The theme of imperial victory received a sustained emphasis in the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus, and indeed an inscription stressing this aspect of their rule is among the earliest known for these emperors. It was stressed with even greater insistence on the coinage minted in the period immediately following Valerian's capture.[24] Coins bearing the legend VICTORIA AVG were among the first to be issued in the name of Postumus, and the emperor's victoriousness remained a constant feature of the coinage of all the western Augusti.[25] Aurelian also issued VICTORIA AVG types, though given the pervasiveness of the theme of victory in the titulature attested for Aurelian in the material evidence (above, Ch.3.a-b), the number of types which specifically refer to imperial victory in this way in his coinage is surprisingly small.[26]

The fact that most of these references probably allude to victory in the field does not give us the licence to specify with any precision which victory (if any) may have

been the occasion for any particular victory coin type or epigraphic reference.[27] Some VICTORIA reverse legends include a numeral; but while it is likely these indicate a particular victory, there is little guidence as to which. The various numberings of the victories of Gallienus in particular have posed severe difficulties, which in spite of much effort have not been definitively resolved. Legends apparently celebrating a "seventh" victory for Gallienus early in the sole reign perhaps correspond to the "VII P VII F" of the legionary types mentioned above (4.a). However, these coincide with other coin types which refer to a "third" victory; futhermore, these latter continued to be minted over a considerable period of time.[28] To these must be added types referring to an eighth victory from the decennalian issues and the various citations of Imperator and Germanicus Maximus with their enumerations (above, 3.a). In practice it must be admitted, even after all due allowances have been made for errors on the part of both the ancient stone and die cutters and modern scholarship, that several different numbering systems must have been in use at different times and places during Gallienus' reign.[29] The finer details of the dating are not our concern here; what matters is that specific victories were celebrated and that such tallies were kept at all.

Other victory types which may be presumed to refer to actual victories specify the vanquished foe (see Appendix, table A:8). Even here, however, one cannot always

correlate these types precisely with campaigns known about from other sources (especially literary and archaeological). Occasionally references can be still more helpful: an inscription for Aurelian specifies his victories over Zenobia and the Carpi in 272.[30] Aurelian's hard-won defeat of the Germanic invasions of Italy in the autumn of 271 was probably the occasion for the inscription from Pisaurum, a town directly threatened by the invasion, in which Aurelian's victories are represented as eternal. The same idea is also found on the coinage of Valerian and Gallienus.[31]

It is important to remember, in this context, that Victoria was a goddess in her own right who had long received cult worship at Rome.[32] Many reverse types, besides those noted above, depict Victoria herself as the guarantor of the emperor's victories. A coin type for Postumus, on which Victoria is shown leading the emperor's horse, bears the legend VICT COMES AVG, and she is referred to in this same role on several occasions on the coinage of Victorinus and Tetricus.[33] Often she is shown crowning the emperor with a laurel wreath as a token of his victories; on one such type for Postumus the emperor rides with Victoria in a quadriga.[34] Though such symbolism is idealized, these types are unlikely to be mere abstractions with no reference to victories on the ground.

This last type introduces another aspect of the relationship between the emperor and the concept of victory: the legend reads VOT PVBL, suggesting a direct link between the acceptance of the emperor's authority and his success on the battlefield. This theme is amplified on coins minted for Gallienus, and later Postumus and Tetricus, on which their quinquennalian and decennalian vota are associated with divinely inspired victory. On these coins Victoria is depicted inscribing the relevant vota on a shield. The legend usually refers to the vota also, though titular reverse legends are also used and in at least one case the legend refers directly to victory.[35] On another type associating these vota with military success, the whole reverse is taken up with the inscribed shield surrounded by a victory laurel wreath. This type was first produced for Valerian at the very beginning of his reign in anticipation of his decennalia; though it was not to be, the answering vows were recorded on similar coin types issued in 262 for his surviving son and co-ruler. The emphasis placed on Gallienus' decennalia on his coinage is scarcely surprising: no emperor since Severus Alexander had reigned long enough to celebrate ten years of rule.[36]

A similar association between victory and the vota can probably be seen in the coinage of Aurelian. Of the small number of denarii minted after his currency reform, the majority of which bore the legend VICTORIA AVG, several display the curious mark VSV in the exergue. One possible

interpretation is to see this as a value-mark, corresponding to those which appear on the reformed antoniniani. A more likely explanation, however, is that these coins were produced to coincide with the emperor's quinquennalian celebrations. In this case the mark represents the fulfilment of the vows taken at the beginning of his reign: <u>vota soluta V</u> (sc. <u>quinquennalia</u>).[37]

Victoria is not by any means the only deity to be singled out on the coinage of this period as the emperor's military companion and the divine sponsor of his victorious exploits. Particularly noteworthy in this regard are Mars and Hercules, two deities closely identified with the courage and military excellence of third century emperors. These both deserve special attention in this present context, which we shall come to directly. We shall see later that Roma, Venus, Apollo, Jupiter and Sol were also explicitly associated with imperial victory (below, 4.c/4.d).

ii) Mars as the inspiration of imperial virtus

The central importance of imperial <u>virtus</u> in the representation of the emperor as supreme victor goes far beyond the references we noted above in the context of the emperor's symbolic association with the armies. The emphasis placed on this quality played a key part in the image of all third-century emperors, but it was a theme

especially strongly stressed for Gallienus, whose virtus was even referred to on one inscription as Invicta.[38] On the coinage of Gallienus it was personalized as VIRT(VS) GALLIENI AVG(VSTI), which appeared on the coinage for the first time at the Gallic mint late in the joint reign and was later repeated elsewhere. Some time later the same mint, by now in the hands of Postumus, produced analogous legends for Gallienus' rival.[39]

The iconography of the numerous coin types which refer to imperial virtus, both for Gallienus and for the other emperors with whom we are concerned, is of particular interest for our present purpose because of the way in which it reflects the close relationship between the emperor and Mars. The description of these types in modern numismatic accounts, however, has produced some serious difficulties which must be overcome before we can appreciate the full significance of these types. In order to do this we must consider them alongside a wider range of closely related types (Appendix, tables A:6, A:9-11).

Some of the virtus types provide relatively few problems. On certain coins the emperor is shown as the victorious warrior in the heat of battle: he is shown on horseback charging down his enemy, whom he mercilessly spears, in iconography familiar from Hellenistic art and foreshadowing later representations of St George. On others the emperor is shown on horseback, still with his spear, his hand raised as if receiving acclamations from

his victorious army (iconography associated equally with the virtus of both the emperor and his troops, see above Ch.4.a). Other types emphasize the same theme by depicting the spoils of the emperor's victories, sometimes accompanied by captives.[40]

Most of the remaining types, actually the vast majority, have proved more perplexing, though the anomalies and difficulties have passed virtually unnoticed. In most cases the figure on these reverse types is conventionally described in numismatic texts as "Virtus". This description is misleading. In the first place, in spite of its manly connotations, the word virtus is feminine, and like the personifications of other feminine abstract nouns on the coinage, one would expect a female figure if a simple personification were intended. In the second place, the iconography of types described as "Virtus" overlaps with that of a number of types with other legends which clearly indicate that the figure depicted is either Mars or the emperor himself as the god of war. The conventional descriptions of such "Virtus" and Mars types are thus both inconsistent and confusing.

These inconsistencies and confusions can be removed at a stroke if we reject the notion of an abstraction labelled "Virtus". We have already seen that the portraiture on this coinage drew a strong analogy, amounting more or less to identification, between the emperor and Mars (above, 3.c). We observed that the helmeted bust obverse and

reverse types for Gallienus and Postumus, notably those associated with VIRTVS legends, portray the emperor as Mars. This point can now be reinforced by comparing such types to the bust types that unquestionably refer to Mars (Appendix, table A:9, no. 10a, cf. 10b-d). In fact, there can be no doubt that the reverse iconography of a substantial proportion of the so-called "Virtus" types (and indeed other closely related types) deliberately associate the emperor and his virtus with Mars. This is achieved either by representing the emperor in the guise of Mars, or by depicting the god as the inspiration and guarantor of the emperor's virtus.[41]

In some instances where Mars is portrayed as the emperor's companion and the guarantor of his virtus the god is represented at the emperor's side. An example of this symbolism has already been alluded to in connection with the emperor's association with his armies (above, n.10). The exceptional DEFENSOR ORBIS reverse type for Victorinus is in essence also a portrayal of imperial virtus, and again (though the iconography is controversial) it almost certainly displays Mars as the emperor's divine comes.[42] (A type minted for Gallienus in the joint reign likewise shows Mars as the emperor's companion-at-arms, urging him to great deeds of valour.[42a])

Much the same symbolism is found elsewhere on the coinage of the same emperor: the title of COMES AVG is given to Mars on a reverse type depicting a bust of Mars,

and the obverse of another aureus type, depicting the jugate busts of the emperor and Mars, coupled with the reverse type VICTORIA AVG (half-length bust of Victoria). This jugate pairing had earlier appeared for Postumus on a virtus type. Mars is similarly jugate with Victoria on the reverse of another type for Postumus with the legend CONSERVATORES AVG, once again stressing the close association between Mars and the emperor's capacity for winning victories.[43] Mars is further associated with the emperor's rule, and with his success in battle in particular, on many other types. In some cases the god is depicted on the emperor's titular reverse types; in others the reverse legend accords the god some appropriate epithet (such as Propugnator, Victor and Pacifer), by which his role as the emperor's divine helper is emphasized.[44]

The most remarkable feature of the various coin types that associate Mars with imperial success is the iconographic fluidity through which Mars, the god of war and the bringer of peace, is identified with the emperor's virtus (just as he was also identified with the virtus of the imperial armies). The close association between the emperor and Mars which we found on the obverse iconography (above, Ch.3.c) is taken to the point where the emperor and his divine companion are seen to be more or less interchangeable. In these various ways imperial authority is symbolically represented as under the tutelage of Mars.

In practice, as we shall see, Mars is not the only deity to be so represented.

iii) Hercules as the inspiration of imperial virtus

The case for identifying the figure of "Virtus" with Mars (or the emperor as Mars) is strengthened by the association of similar types with other deities, for example Dea Roma (see below, Ch.4.c). By far the most important of these is Hercules. The connection between Hercules, the divine hero who laboured to rid the world of evil, and the emperor's courage and military success has already been noted (above, 3.c).

As with Mars, the fact that the iconography of the types which mention Hercules directly and those which refer to the emperor or his <u>virtus</u> are interchangeable is of great symbolic significance. Such Herculean types can be found for Aurelian and Tetricus, though, just as with the Herculean obverse styles, it is Gallienus and above all Postumus (whose coinage took this analogy to quite extraordinary lengths) who are most closely associated with Hercules in this way on the reverses (see Appendix, table A:11). As noted with the Mars types, Hercules is sometimes here associated with the peace that the emperor's victories have won (table A:11, no. 5).

One reverse type for Gallienus (one of the many to be minted with the Alexander-Herakles obverse type)

associates the weapons of the divine hero with the emperor's own virtus through the legend VIRTVS FALERI. Falerius was probably intended as a sobriquet of Gallienus, who maintained a strong attachment with Falerii in northern Italy; this attachment is reflected in many ways in the material evidence for his reign, and almost certainly stems from the fact that it was the emperor's native area. The weapons of Hercules are displayed again on certain types for Postumus, with a titular reverse legend or HERCVLI ROMANO AVG. These types show clearly how the Hercules coinage of Postumus drew its inspiration from that of Commodus.[45]

An inscription from northern Italy for Aurelian, set up alongside the one commemorating his "eternal victories" we noted above, presents Hercules as an equal partner in imperial rule, thereby lending the emperor a share in his divine authority.[46] This idea was expressed graphically and remarkably often on the coinage of Postumus. The close association between Postumus and Hercules on his coinage is such that it could form a complete subject of inquiry on its own.[47] Hercules is represented as the companion and divine counterpart of the emperor, whose deeds of valour on behalf of mankind are deliberately equated with the feats of Hercules. The overt nature of this programme, the iconographic relation of the various types and the interrelation of the symbolic connotations preclude the rather crude distinction sometimes drawn by

modern commentators between Hercules the war-god and Hercules the world-ruler.[48]

In addition to the obverse types where Postumus was represented as Hercules which we mentioned (above, 3.c), a surprisingly large proportion of Postumus' gold types, and several other coins of his besides, depict the emperor and his divine comes together on the obverse as jugate busts. There was an especially high concentration of such types on the aurei in the second half of the reign.[49] The same jugate pairing is found on the reverse of his coins which refer to Hercules directly as COMITI AVG and CONSERVATORI AVG, while on others with the legend FELICITAS AVG the busts of Hercules and Postumus face each other.[50] Hercules is also represented in this role on an exceptional bronze type with the legend HERCVLI COMITI AVG COS III, depicting a sacrificial scene attended by Hercules. On a coin type bearing the legend AETERNITAS AVG Hercules crowns the emperor with a laurel wreath.[51] The identification between Postumus and his divine alter ego, taken to great lengths on his coinage, represents a truly remarkable symbolic affinity between the two, especially by comparison with the other western emperors.[52]

The coinage of Postumus also mentions Hercules with the uncommon epithets Magusanus and Deusoniensis; both are apparently local cults. The HERCVLI MAGVSANO coins are exceedingly rare. The various forms of the reverse legend

HERCVLI DEVSONIENSI, by contrast, are among the commonest minted for Postumus. They are attested in all metals (copper, billon and gold) and several different iconographic types. It seems that he felt some special and personal attraction for this cult: one of the iconographic types shows a cult statue of the god within a tetrastyle temple, probably referring to the dedication by the emperor of a temple to Hercules Deusoniensis. Among other types, there is also one which depicts a half-length bust with lion pelt and club which might be either the emperor or his tutelary god. The interchangeability of the two is reinforced by the contemporary type with the same iconography but bearing the legend POSTVMVS AVGVSTVS.[53]

Certain rare aurei and bronze medallions, types probably intended for gold, depict the god in the act of carrying out some of his labours.[54] Towards the end of his reign, probably in 268 and perhaps in anticipation of his decennalia, Postumus issued a truly unique and quite remarkable series of coins in this vein, representing each of the divine hero's labours in turn. On each of the types in this justly famous "labours of Hercules" series, the reverse legend gives Hercules a more or less appropriate epithet. It was minted in gold and base metal, while four individual examples, covering just two of the types, are known also as antoniniani.[55]

* * *

The emphasis placed upon imperial victory and upon the emperor's divinely inspired virtus is a central theme of the symbolic representation of imperial authority in this period, as indeed at all periods in the Roman empire. The emphasis given to these themes complements and amplifies the symbolism of the titulature explored in the previous chapter (in particular the titles Pius Felix Invictus, the acclamation Imperator, and the varied and numerous cognomina victoriarum: Ch.3.a-b). The representation of imperial virtus as being closely associated both with Mars and with Hercules is likewise an extension of the iconographic use of the attributes of these deities in the imperial obverse portraiture of the period (above, Ch.3.c). Although the intimate and highly personal association between Postumus and Hercules is taken further than was customary, the basis of this symbolic representation is not a new departure, but rather an exaggeration of an existing trend.

4.c The Mythology of Re-foundation: The Emperor and the Eternal Destiny of Rome

i) Eternal peace and security

Ever since the time of Augustus, internal peace had been the most cherished of all the benefits of imperial rule: the closing of the doors of the temple of Janus and

supremely the construction of the Ara Pacis had been among the many ways in which Augustus himself had laid stress on the centrality of this idea. Coins minted at the beginning of Gallienus' sole reign with the legend IANO PATRI may, by reference to Augustus' symbolic action, signify a promise of imperial peace.[56] In the political instability of the third century it may at times have seemed somewhat idealistic, but it must have been all the more valued for that. Not surprisingly, therefore, the legend PAX AVG(VSTI) figures prominently on the coinage of all these emperors; indeed it completely dominates the billon issues of Victorinus.[57]

This vital symbolic concept of peace, occasionally referred to as "eternal" and "everywhere", was represented as being procured as a direct result of the emperor's victories: thus the VBIQVE PAX types minted for Gallienus, representing Victoria in her chariot. Analogous symbolism recurs on titular reverse types minted for Postumus and for Tetricus, in which the emperor, holding the olive branch of peace, rides in victory's chariot.[58]

A more mysterious and decidedly novel way in which the imperial family was linked to the concept of peace is provided by a long series of coins minted for Salonina at Milan during the sole reign. These bear the legend AVG(VSTA) IN PACE, depicting the empress enthroned as Pax, holding a branch and sceptre. This type has no parallel in Roman coinage, and the exact significance is disputed.

It has been suggested that the type might convey a cryptic indication of the empress' conversion to Christianity; without further evidence, however, this seems an over-interpretation. A more likely explanation is simply that the empress is here represented as presiding over the peace that the emperor's victories have provided.[59]

As well as peace, the emperor's victorious rule was represented as bringing security. The coinage echoes this concern with a variety of types, some again suggesting that the achievement was everlasting.[60] The emperor's maintenance of public security was represented on the coinage as a cause for reassurance, trust and popular support.[61] The concept of public support was also conveyed by coin types referring to <u>concordia</u>, which could likewise be represented as eternal.[62]

Through his provision of public security the emperor was associated with the welfare of the community in a way which helped to cement the bond between the local communities and the emperor. Coins referring to SALVS PROVINCIARVM, one of Postumus' earliest types, and DACIA FELIX, minted for Aurelian, reflect this concern.[63] The relationship between the emperor and an individual community could be represented as especially close, as on those inscriptions and coins which linked Gallienus and his family to Falerii, or those inscriptions which represent the emperor as a new founder of a town or city: as with the military units (above, 4.a), this entailed the

town taking the emperor's name. A few examples are attested in these reigns, including one from Verona of AD 265 which mentions the building of the town's fortification walls.[64]

The coinage of these reigns represents a host of other benefits arising out of the emperor's provision of imperial peace and security: from the abundance provided by the trade that flourished under the umbrella of imperial security to the happiness and well-being ushered in by the emperor's care for his people.[65] The cornucopia, as a symbol of plenty, is a common device on coins advertising such benefits. A type for Victorinus with the novel legend GAVDIA PVBLICA depicts four maidens, representing the seasons, supporting a giant cornucopia between them.[66] Typical of this entire category is the concept of <u>felicitas</u>, mentioned frequently on the coinage in various forms, including AET(erna); on many of these types the personification of Felicitas is shown holding the cornucopia, and sometimes a caduceus. FELICITAS AVGG in particular was minted in great numbers and over a long period for Valerian at the mint of Rome. In one instance at least, on a gold type for Postumus, the contingency of this concept upon the emperor's military achievements is made explicit.[67]

A type minted for Postumus, depicting simply a winged caduceus, bears the unusual legend SAECVLO FRVGIFERO.[68] Traditionally, however, the caduceus was most closely

associated with Mercury, whose relationship with trade we have noted (above, 3.c). As the herald of the gods, Mercury may also have been thought of as the emperor's divine intercessor with the other deities of the pantheon, and thus as the guarantor of the emperor's ultimate success in providing peace and security.[69] A titular reverse aureus depicts Postumus sacrificing at an altar attended by Mercury. Another contemporary reverse type, INTERNVTIVS (sic) DEORVM (Mercury with caduceus), probably reflects the same symbolic associations, though it has also been interpreted as a specific reference to the negotiations that Postumus initiated with Gallienus after the latter's inconclusive campaign in Gaul.[70]

ii) The foundation myths of eternal Rome: Imperial destiny as the fusion of past, present and future

The safety and security of the empire were seen to rest not only on the emperor's efforts in the present, but also on his provision for the future. The most obvious manifestation of this idea was conveyed by the promotion of dynastic ideals. The legend SPES PVBLICA, strongly associated with the young Caesars, must be understood in this light: the young prince himself was represented as the future hope for his people. Coins bearing this legend were minted for Saloninus in Gaul and, much later, for both Tetrici simultaneously; SPEI PERPETVAE is also attested for Tetricus II.[71]

Dynastic claims were also fostered by those inscriptions mentioning several members of the imperial family, either together on a single inscription, or individually on a group of parallel inscriptions. Coinage was also issued in honour of two or more members of the imperial family at a time, the concept of imperial <u>concordia</u> being used to stress the harmony between members of the ruling family.[72] In addition to the obverse types depicting the two Tetrici together (above, 3.a), the dynastic ideal was promoted on reverse types which represented the emperor and his son together, as well as on coins minted in their names with the legend NOBILITAS AVGG, showing the personification of noble lineage (or the prince in this guise) carrying a sceptre and globe.[73]

Both the happiness of the times and the provision of a secure future helped to contribute to the representation of the emperor's reign as a "golden age". Certain coins minted for Valerian and Gallienus associate the eternal benefits of their reign with a return to the Golden Age of Saturn.[74] Similarly, their reign was represented as a reflection of the eternity of Rome itself: the authority of Gallienus and Aurelian is represented as eternal, stretching back to the very foundation of the city, through the iconography of the she-wolf suckling the infants Romulus and Remus. The strong association we noted with Mars (above, 4.b), reinforces this link, since Mars was the mythical father of Romulus; indeed the symbolic connection is made explicit on a type minted for

Gallienus depicting Mars and Rhea Silvia.[75] Coins for Salonina with the legend VESTA, or VESTA AETERNA, likewise associated the imperial house with a deity who symbolized the eternity of Rome.[76]

Such allusions to Roma Aeterna were simultaneously guarantees for the future and evocations of the past. The various reverse types which directly mention ROMAE AETERNAE usually depict the goddess seated, often with a spear and shield, sometimes also holding a victriola; occasionally the emperor stands before her. The emperor's victorious achievements are thus blended with the glorious and eternal destiny of Rome (see Appendix, table A:13). Such types are also known for Postumus and Tetricus; given that these emperors never actually ruled at Rome, this is highly significant. The Tetricus type has Roma holding a victriola, but on the Postumus type she holds the palladium, the very symbol of Rome's eternity. Other types with the same legend for Gallienus, Postumus and Victorinus depict a bust of Dea Roma.[77]

The association also extends to other coin types that do not name the goddess directly. For example, the same bust of Roma is shown, this time jugate with Diana, on a reverse type for Victorinus with the legend VOTA AVGVSTI. The emperor's authority is simultaneously linked to Dea Roma and to the institutions of her city: titular reverse types for both Gallienus and Postumus depict the goddess; another type associates her with Victorinus' second

consulship. Doubts have been expressed about the identification on the Postumianic type, but the iconography is unmistakable: the goddess is seated, this time upon a cuirass, against the back side of which rests a shield; in her free hand she holds a spear, and her drapery is shown drawn down to expose completely her right shoulder. This "amazon" style drapery is very characteristic of Roma on the coinage of this period.[78]

Roma is also depicted on coins minted for Gallienus with the reverse legend VIRTVS AVG, so that Dea Roma joins Mars and Hercules as an example of the divine personification of imperial <u>virtus</u>. Dea Roma is almost certainly to be identified on another type behind the misnomer "Virtus" as the figure leading the triumphant Gallienus back from the scene of his victories: in this case the legend (ROMA REDVX) is self-explanatory. The problematic description "Virtus" has also allowed three further types, all for Tetricus, to go largely unnoticed in this context. The legends of the first two refer directly to <u>virtus</u>, but as with the Gallienic type the iconography points unmistakably to Dea Roma: on one she is seated as on Postumus' titular reverse type, except that in addition she holds an olive branch; on the other she stands erect holding a shield resting on the ground in her left hand and a spear in her right. The third instance is a titular reverse. Again the standing helmeted figure, holding a sceptre (or spear) and an olive branch, is quite certainly Roma: again her drapery, extending to the ankles, is

pulled down to expose the right shoulder and breast, while her right foot rests on a globe.[79]

In many parts of the empire the worship of the emperor had long been associated with that of Dea Roma in civic cult practice, especially in the eastern provinces. It was not until the reign of Hadrian, however, that Roma acquired a temple in her own city. On the festival of the Parilia, that is on the dies natalis urbis (21 April: from that date renamed the Romala), Hadrian dedicated a new temple to the east of the forum to Venus and Roma. Venus had been intimately associated with the history and destiny of eternal Rome from the foundation of the empire. As the mother of Aeneas, she was connected with the foundation not only of Rome itself, but of the gens Iulia, and therefore of the entire lineage of Augusti who claimed symbolic descent from Augustus and thus from Caesar. As such Venus was already worshipped at the temple of Venus Genetrix, and as such she had been associated with Augustus (as the New Romulus) in the Forum Augusti. In this way the urban cult of Venus et Roma became a counterpoint to the provincial cult of Roma et Augustus.[80]

The strong triple association between the imperial house, Venus and the foundation and eternity of the city was thus well established by the mid-third century. Coins minted for Salonina refer to Venus Genetrix, implying that Salonina too was to be the mother of a long line of emperors.[81] The association between this deity and the

fortunes of the imperial house is further reflected on those types which mention the goddess in her martial capacity as the divine guarantor of imperial victory: Venus Victrix was prominent on coins of Salonina and appears also on coinage minted for Gallienus; it is almost certainly Venus Victrix again who is depicted on a coin for Aurelian with the legend PROVIDENT AVG.[82] Hadrian's temple was in fact dedicated to Venus Felix; the epithet has connotations of fecundity and thus may also relate to the empress' role as the founder of a dynasty. Coins with the legend VENVS FELIX are known for both Salonina and Severina, and the iconography of the former, closely resembling that of the Venus Genetrix types, perhaps suggests procreation.[83]

Salonina is associated with other deities strongly linked to fertility and fecundity: in the sole reign she is linked to Ceres; earlier, in the joint reign, a type for Salonina honouring Dea Segetia was issued at the Gallic mint alongside analogous types for Valerian and Gallienus which honour Vulcan and Mars respectively.[84] The importance attached to the empress as the provider of imperial heirs, which was suggested by some of the Venus types, must also be the significance of FECVNDITAS AVG types (identifying Salonina with the personification of fecundity, depicted with one or more children), while her suitability as the mother of future emperors is stressed by references to her PVDICITIA and PIETAS.[85]

The symbolic connection between the emperor and the gens Iulia not only linked the reigning emperor to the mythical beginnings of Rome but also served to relate him directly to the founder of the empire as such, Augustus. Gallienus even issued coins which specifically emphasized the close association between himself and the divine Augustus.[86] The association with former emperors was undoubtedly a motive for the issue of coins commemorating the deification of a predecessor. As noted above (Ch.2.c), the massive coin issue in memory of the deified Claudius Gothicus has now been dated convincingly to the first twelve months of the reign of Aurelian. Since the issue was produced simultaneously at all four of the mints under Aurelian's direct control at the outset of his reign, the directive may be presumed to have come from the emperor himself. It may be, therefore, that this issue represents a deliberate attempt on the part of Aurelian to associate himself with his revered and popular predecessor, and it must have formed part of a public relations exercise to reinforce the impression that Aurelian had succeeded Claudius directly, thereby minimizing the significance of the brief usurpation of Quintillus. A similar, though less intensive issue was minted in the early stages of Tetricus' reign in honour of Divus Victorinus.[87]

* * *

The evidence surveyed presents the emperor as the provider of peace and security, the founding-father, the hope for the future of the empire and, in himself, the eternity of Rome personified. As with Mars and Hercules, the extent of the relationship between the emperors considered here and Dea Roma, as represented on their coinage, had become somewhat disguised by the intrusive misnomer "Virtus". The empresses and junior emperors are also represented in prominent roles in the symbolic scheme of hope in an eternal imperial peace and security. As in the previous section, it is clear that these main areas of emphasis flesh out and reinforce the symbolism of the titulature.

4d. Divine Tutelage, Divine Sanction and Predestination

The protection of the gods and their aid in making possible the emperor's endless and supremely victorious reign is a very important aspect of third-century imperial symbolism. At times this theme is extended to one of divine ordination and even predestination. Apart from Hercules, Mars and Roma, whose roles have already been reviewed, the principal divine sponsors in this symbolic representation were Jupiter and Juno, Apollo and Diana (both luminary deities, sometimes equivalent to Sol and Luna) and Sol. As we noted in the previous chapter (3.c), this close association could at times take on the form of

assimilation, and in this material the emperor is often presented as godlike or even divine.

i) Divine protection and assistance

Imperial pietas lay at the foundation of the emperor's relationship with the gods, and this quality is represented on the coinage in several ways, including those scenes where the emperor is shown sacrificing to the gods.[88] Certain types with the legend PIETAS AVG(G) display sacrificial implements; this type, especially associated with young Caesars, is attested for Valerian II, Saloninus and Tetricus II.[89]

The safety and health of the emperor were of genuine importance to his subjects whose own safety to some extent depended upon them. Many inscriptions beseech the gods to protect the emperor, whose well-being was also represented on the coinage as under divine protection.[90] Usually such coins depict the personification of health, Salus (Hygieia), but some from the sole reign of Gallienus place the health of the emperor under the direct protection of Aesculapius. Similar types are also known for Postumus. Aesculapius is also among those deities represented on the coinage as CONSERVATOR AVG. On coins minted for both Valerian and Gallienus, the guardian of the emperor's health is sometimes Apollo, Aesculapius' father, who played a significant role eslewhere on this coinage.[91]

The goddess Minerva was particularly associated with war. Although she was never actually depicted on a VIRTVS type as such, the Minerva types for Gallienus, Postumus and Aurelian are iconographically closely related to some of those we considered above associated with Mars (above, 4.b).[92] Minerva is one of several deities whose support for Gallienus' authority is represented through her appearance on his titular reverse types; others include both Neptune and, perhaps more surprisingly, Serapis. Neptune is similarly associated with Aurelian, and on the coinage of Postumus both Neptune and Serapis are hailed as the emperor's companions.[93] Another rather unusual deity mentioned on the coinage of Postumus is Castor. The type depicts Castor with a horse, an animal strongly associated with the Dioscuri; but whether the type was intended to honour Postumus' cavalry, or to ask for the protection of Castor for a sea journey, or simply to associate the emperor with another deity whose valour served to win him immortality, it is impossible to say.[94]

Jupiter, as the most powerful deity of the Roman pantheon, was regularly associated with imperial authority in a great many ways on the coinage and inscriptions of the period. In most of these he is presented as the emperor's divine patron and supporter. In this respect the mention of Jupiter's epithet Stator on the coinage is very relevant, and on one type for Gallienus the legend refers to IOVI PATRI.[95] Jupiter is also found on titular reverse types for Valerian and Gallienus.[96] More

commonly, he is represented on the coinage as the emperor's divine conservator. On some of these the iconography reinforces the idea by showing the god and the emperor together. One such type for Postumus has their two busts jugate on the reverse, and the same iconography reappears on an obverse type for Victorinus.[97] A very important series of coins with the reverse legend IOVI CONSER(VATORI) was minted for Aurelian at most of his mints over a long period from late 271 to the summer of 273. These Aurelianic types depict what amounts to divine investiture, with the god handing the emperor a globe. The same scene is repeated on certain coins with the legends CONCORD MILIT and FIDES MILIT, implying, perhaps, that since Aurelian's reign was ordained by Jupiter the support of the armies must follow as a matter of religious duty. A fragment from Peter the Patrician lends support to this interpretation.[98]

Throughout the coinage of this period Jupiter is often represented as the guarantor of imperial victory by means of the epithets Propugnator and Victor.[99] The connection between Jupiter and imperial victories is represented on a remarkable pair of types minted in Gaul over a considerable period of time during the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus. These coin types probably celebrate a significant series of victories won by Gallienus during his campaigning on the Rhine frontier in the late 250s. Those minted in the name of Valerian read GALLIENVS CVM EXER SVO and depict a statue of Jupiter

holding a victriola mounted on a base which is inscribed IOVI VICTORI. The corresponding type for Gallienus has the legend IOVI VICTORI depicting an exactly analogous statue of the emperor inscribed IMP C(um) E(xercitu) S(uo). The parallel between emperor and god is striking.[100] On a type minted for Gallienus at the beginning of the sole reign Jupiter is referred to as Ultor, possibly in anticipation of a campaign of retribution against Valerian's captors that never in fact materialized.[101] On one Aurelianic inscription, Jupiter Optimus Maximus is called upon to protect the emperor, and on another it is almost certainly the same god to whom thanks are offered for Aurelian's victories over Palmyra and the Carpi.[102]

Jupiter is also mentioned with these specifically Capitoline epithets on the coinage of Postumus, where he is represented as the sponsor of the emperor's "golden age". The design of the coin was based on a an earlier type minted for Commodus, though in fact the copy is inexact, possibly due to error rather than intent.[103] In a similar vein, Jupiter is associated with the eternity of the emperors Valerian and Gallienus.[104] Other coin types, minted in the name of the young Valerian Junior and bearing the reverse legend IOVI CRESCENTI, represent Amalthea with the infant Jupiter. This symbolism, which links the return of the Golden Age to the dynastic hopes of the Licinian house, was repeated on coins with the legends LAETIT TEMP and PIET SAECVLI minted in the name of

Gallienus, but evidently referring to his son. It is possible that a sole-reign medallion coupling the same reverse iconography with the legend PIETAS FALERI may carry the same significance, since the obverse has a dynastic theme (CONCORDIA AVGG, joint portraits of Gallienus and Salonina); if so, it must refer to the birth of Marinianus, Gallienus' youngest son.[105]

The iconography of some of the consecration issues minted in the name of the deified Valerian Caesar takes the form of an eagle. The bird of Jupiter was traditionally associated with imperial divination. An interesting parallel is drawn by the consecration issue for his grandmother Mariniana, which depicts a peacock, Juno's sacred bird.[106] Juno appears regularly on the coinage of Salonina at several mints, by far the most common deity to appear on coinage minted for the empress. The coins mostly refer to IVNO REGINA, who is likewise associated with Severina, but with considerably less frequency. The cult of Juno Regina was strongly associated with Roman victories, in a similar fashion to the cult of Capitoline Jupiter.[107] The parallel between emperor and empress on the one hand and the king and queen of heaven on the other, which is indicated on several of the types we have mentioned, was reinforced by coins for Gallienus and Salonina minted simultaneously from the same officina (N) at the mint of Rome. On these coins the emperor is represented as under the protection of Jupiter, while his consort is protected by Juno.[108]

A most remarkable example of the representation of imperial authority under divine protection is to be found in the unique series of coins which constituted the entire last issue minted at Rome for the Emperor Gallienus, probably dating to the last couple of years of his reign. Each coin type was dedicated to one of a select group of nine deities in their role as protector of the emperor and his consort. The unusual reverse iconography of this issue depicts a variety of symbolic animals, both real and mythical, which correlate to the deities named in a more or less straightforward way (table 4:1, above).

Table 4:2

The -CONS AVG series minted at Rome
AD 267-8 for Gallienus

Reverse legend	Alternative iconographies
For Gallienus	
APOLLINI CONS AVG	Centaur; Griphon; Winged horse (Pegasus?).
DIANAE CONS AVG	Doe; Stag; Antelope; Boar; Goat?
HERCVLI CONS AVG	Boar (Erymanthian?) ; Lion (Nemean?)
IOVI CONS AVG	Goat (Amalthea?)
IVNONI CONS AVG	Goat (or stag?)
LIBERO P CONS AVG	Tigress (? sometimes called "Panther")
MERCVRIO CONS AVG	Criocamp
NEPTVNO CONS AVG	Hippocamp; Capricorn
SOLI CONS AVG	Bull; Winged horse (presumably from Sol's chariot)
For Salonina	
DIANAE CONS AVG	Doe (hybrid?)
IVNONI CONS AVG	Doe

On reverse iconography, see Besly & Bland (1983), 188-94.
On arrangement of types at the various officinae, see Cunetio 1336ff.

The exact significance of the various types in this "animal series" is not entirely clear, though it has been suggested that it might have something to do with propitiation rites and games held to enlist the help of the deities mentioned to deal with plague and military invasions. In practice, however, there is insufficient evidence to secure any one explanation; all we can say for certain is that it represents the most comprehensive expression of Gottesgnadentum in this period.[109] A few of the types from this issue were also minted at Siscia, but only mentioning Diana, Apollo, Liber Pater and Neptune.[110]

Besides these two issues from Rome and Siscia, no other mention is made of Liber Pater (Dionysus) on the coinage of Gallienus, and both Neptune and Mercury also make relatively few appearances on his coinage. The other deities mentioned in this special series, however, are precisely those who figure most prominently elsewhere on the coinage of the Licinii: Hercules, Jupiter, Juno, Apollo, Diana and Sol. Of these, Diana is the best represented in this "animal series", both numerically and in terms of variety of reverse iconography.[111]

Coins reading DIANA FELIX were minted at Milan for Gallienus in the joint reign and were among the very few types at this mint to be retained after his father's capture. Diana is also depicted on a type minted for Valerian bearing the legend RELIGIO AVGG.[112] Contemporary with this last type, and from the same officina, coins

with the legend CONSERVAT AVGG depict either Diana and her twin brother or just Apollo alone. Elsewhere on the coinage of these emperors Apollo is accorded the same tutelary function. He is also represented as Propugnator, that is as a divine aid in imperial victory.[113] Apollo is once again portrayed as the emperor's tutelary deity on the coinage of Aurelian, and he is also presented as the sponsor of the same emperor's reign on a titular reverse type.[114]

Although Apollo and Diana were distinct from Sol and Luna, they nevertheless had strong solar and lunar affiliations. Particularly interesting in this respect are types which portray a goddess holding a torch, bearing the interchangeable legends DIANA LVCIFERA and LVNA LVCIFERA. Diana is also hailed as both Lucifera and Redux on the antoniniani of Postumus.[115] She is acclaimed as ADIVTRIX AVG on some unusual coins of Victorinus, and coins minted for the same emperor with the legend VOTA AVGVSTI depict her bust jugate with a bust of Victoria or opposing one of her divine brother; this latter pairing is also found among several types minted for Postumus with the legend CONSERVATORES AVG.[116]

ii) The emperor and Sol

The importance attached to light and solar imagery generally in the representation of imperial authority at this date is reflected in the emphasis given to Sol on the

coinage. By the middle of the third century various cults of Sol were firmly established throughout the empire, especially in the eastern and Danubian provinces. From early in the century the cult of Sol in the Roman empire had become strongly influenced by various oriental solar cults: notably, but not exclusively, the Syrian cult of Baal (Elagabalus).[117]

The Licinian coinage specifically mentions Sol Invictus and also draws a highly significant analogy between the emperor and the rising sun with coins reading ORIENS AVG(G) depicting Sol (or the emperor as Sol). This symbolism was a common feature of third century imperial ideology, but was given particular emphasis under Valerian. This legend had an obvious semantic link with the representation of the emperor as Restitutor Orientis (a link that is made explicit for Gallienus). As part of the general solar imagery surrounding imperial authority, however, it had no particular connection with the eastern part of the empire.[118] The analogy between the emperor and Sol was also expressed on coins of Valerian and Gallienus proclaiming them RESTITVT GENER HVMANI. The close association was also reflected on titular reverse types for Valerian and on numerous types referring to the aeternitas of the emperors.[119]

This solar affinity is well represented on the coinage of the western emperors also. The legend ORIENS AVG is attested at least for Postumus, and the Sol types for

Victorinus with legend INVICTVS are among the most common antoninians for his reign; an aureus type for Victorinus with the same legend depicts the bust of Sol.[120] On certain gold obverses of Victorinus, the bust of the emperor is shown jugate with that of the radiate sun-god. The bust of Sol is also represented on several other types for Postumus: PACATOR ORBIS, an imitation of a type minted for Septimius Severus; AETERNITAS AVG, depicting three radiate busts of Sol, the outer two facing in towards the central one, perhaps in reference to the morning, evening and midday sun; CLARITAS AVG, with jugate busts of Sol and Luna, a pairing which recalls Postumus' CONSERVATORES AVG type showing Apollo and Diana mentioned above.[121]

The relationship between Aurelian and Sol, as expressed in particular on the coinage of the latter half of his reign, is of a quite different order to that of the other emperors of this period. The symbolic expression of the special relationship between Sol and Aurelian began to gather momentum in 272, as Aurelian's eastern campaign got under way, with the production at two of the Balkan mints of coins with the legend ORIENS AVG; this was the earliest appearance of the legend that was to come to dominate the coinage of Aurelian's reign.[122] From the summer of 273 until his death, with the exception of the two eastern mints, coins bearing this legend were minted at every mint that operated for Aurelian. The reverse iconography varied subtly according to date and place of issue, but the symbolism remained essentially the same: that of Sol's

paramount role in bringing about Aurelian's spectacular military successes and of a working partnership between emperor and god that was so close as to be perceived almost in terms of common identity.[123]

Aurelian's association with Sol was also graphically portrayed on many other coin types. The SOLI INVICTO types, including some where the sun-god is depicted riding in his chariot, though minted at many mints in all parts of the empire, cannot compare with the Orlens coins in either number or variety.[124] Sol is represented as the sponsor of Aurelian's reign on a titular reverse type, and as Aurelian's conservator. The idea of Sol as Aurelian's personal tutelary delty is supported also by a couple of inscriptions that specifically call on Sol Invictus to protect the emperor.[125] Late in his reign Aurelian's new mint at Lyon produced solar types with the legend PACATOR ORBIS. The bust of Sol is seen above the emperor and empress as they clasp hands on a late bronze type with the legend CONCORDIA AVG.[126]

An important aspect of Aurelian's special relationship with Sol can be seen on several coin types which depict Sol handing a globe, the symbol of world dominion, to the emperor. Though these coins never became as common as those depicting Jovian investiture with the legend IOVI CONSER(VATORI) had been earlier in the reign, there can be no doubt that Sol took over from Jupiter the role of chief sponsor of Aurelian's rule during the summer of 273

(Appendix, table A:16). The supremacy of Sol over the other gods of the pantheon in the last two years of Aurelian's reign is manifested in the exceptional preponderance of types referring to this one deity, a preponderance which outdoes even the affiliation of Postumus and Hercules. Various types reflect this supremacy iconographically, by depicting Sol handing the globe not to the emperor direct, but to one of the other deities elsewhere portrayed as Aurelian's ally: notably Mars and Hercules.[127] On coins bearing the legend PROVIDEN(TIA) DEOR(VM), a female figure holds a military standard in each hand, greeted by Sol carrying his globe. The scene as a whole represents the divine preordination by which Sol guaranteed Aurelian's authority and required the allegiance of his soldiers. It has been noted that this type combines the iconography of Severina's principal type, CONCORDIAE MILITVM, with that of Aurelian's ORIENS AVG. This observation helps to explain the imagery and its symbolic value, but cannot be pressed to support the idea of "Interregnum" coinage minted under Severina's auspices after Aurelian's death.[128]

Sol, as a deity whose daily triumph over darkness was naturally associated with the east, was an obvious choice of divine patron for an emperor determined to reassert his authority in that part of the empire. The connection between Aurelian's solar imagery and his subjugation of Palmyra and reclamation of the eastern provinces is made abundantly clear. Sol stands in place of the usual

iconography on a few extremely rare RESTITVTOR ORIENTIS types, the earliest of which was minted at Cyzicus as the emperor prepared his first eastern campaign at the end of 271. Similarly, Sol is depicted with the emperor on a select few of the numerous coin types referring to Aurelian as RESTITVTOR ORBIS, a title that was also associated with his eastern successes.[129] On many of the ORIENS AVG types, and on several other solar types, Sol is shown with a captive or two. These captives are invariably shown in "Persian", that is oriental, dress and often in a pose which graphically illustrates their subjection by the emperor with the aid of his divine ally. This iconography, together with the timing and persistence of the production of these types, bears out the testimony of the literary sources that Aurelian specifically sought the aid of Sol in his campaigns against Palmyra and that he personally attributed his successes to an alliance between himself, Invictus Augustus, and the god, Sol Invictus.

This personal bond between emperor and deity was made amply clear not only on Aurelian's coinage but also through his actions. He constructed a splendid temple to Sol Invictus in Rome in which, according to one tradition, he dedicated the treasures taken from the temple of Bel, the principal deity of Palmyra. It is conceivable that Aurelian vowed to construct the temple at Rome as a form of <u>evocatio</u>, since Bel was also a solar deity (like Baal of Emesa). A statue which Aurelian set up in his new

temple in Rome apparently had some unusual features which may have owed their origin to a syncretistic alignment of Bel with the principal deity of Rome, Jupiter. On the other hand there is some evidence to suggest that the temple was based upon that of the sun-god at Heliopolis, and the date of the dedication, 25 December (AD 274), suggests an Egyptian rather than a Syrian calendar. The most likely explanation is that, as Zosimus relates, the temple had two cult statues, one of Sol/Helios and one of Bel (perhaps syncretized with Jupiter), the latter perhaps removed from Palmyra.[130] The construction and dedication of this magnificent temple at Rome formed the culmination of Aurelian's association with Sol, together with the initiation of new games in honour of Sol and the institution of a new priestly college, the pontifices del solis, to administer the new cult and to supervise the games. Thus Aurelian ostentatiously acknowledged his debt of gratitude to his divine patron.[131]

The position of supremacy apparently accorded to Sol over all other gods (including Capitoline Jupiter) by these symbolic gestures and by the testimony of the material and literary evidence for Aurelian's reign may also be corroborated by a few rare and highly distinctive coins from Serdica. The obverse of these coins bear the legend SOL DOM(INVS) IMP(ERI) ROM(ANI); the reverse, with the legend AVRELIANVS AVG CONS, shows the emperor sacrificing, presumably in his capacity as head of the new pontifical college.[132] Though these coins are of great

interest in the context of Aurelian's relationship with Sol, some caution must be applied to the interpretation of these coins as a representation of Sol as the presiding deity of the Roman state. The types involved may have originally been intended for issue in gold, but the only extant versions are in bronze, and these are very rare indeed. Given this, and the fact that they were only produced at Serdica, a mint that was particularly given to innovation and experimentation as we have noted before, there are scarcely grounds for seeing in them the imperial declaration of a new solar monotheism which certain scholars have suggested.[133]

Summary, Chapter 4

The emperors are represented in this material in a way which gives the greatest prominence to their success, as the commanders of Rome's mighty armies, as the providers of peace and security and as the incarnation of Rome's glorious and eternal destiny. Each emperor is represented as the most fitting successor to the long line of Augusti, stretching back to Augustus, the second founder of Rome, and through him to Romulus and Aeneas the forefathers of Rome. The emperor's association with Mars formed part of this symbolism, but was also a reflection of divinely inspired and indeed innately divine imperial <u>virtus</u>. In this same way the emperors are also earthly counterparts

to Hercules, the hero of mankind who rid the world of evil; none more emphatically or more ingeniously than Postumus. The emperors' achievements are also likened to the effect of the rising and unconquerable sun. This accounts for the strong showing of Sol as an important imperial deity, reflecting the importance attached to solar deities in the Hellenistic world generally and formerly in Hellenistic royal ideology in particular. Nowhere is the association between imperial authority and the sun-god taken to greater lengths than in the reign of Aurelian, as shown not only by his actions but by his coinage, which for the entire second half of his reign was completely dominated by Sol.

CHAPTER 5

SYMBOLISM AND LEGITIMATION IN THE MID-THIRD CENTURY: THE QUESTION OF WESTERN SEPARATISM

5.a Inferences Drawn from the Foregoing Survey

Over the course of the previous two chapters an outline of the symbolic representation of imperial authority in the mid-third century has emerged. Within this, it is possible to discern several prominent areas of emphasis which are mutually interdependent, but which, for the sake of clarity, may be treated sequentially under separate headings. In addition to these points, the evidence from the survey also sheds considerable light on the situation in the western provinces at this time.

1) The principal features of the symbolic imagery

The first noteworthy feature of the symbolism concerns the military representation of the emperor. In the imperial titulature, insignia and dress that appears on the coinage and inscriptions of the period there is a remarkable concentration upon representations of the emperor as a general. In the coin imagery overall, the quantity and the variety of the references to the military role of the emperor and to the loyalty of the soldiers

confirm the crucial symbolic importance of the emperor as supreme commander of the armies.[1]

The second feature amounts to the representation of success: in the context of the third century, as the previous paragraph confirms, by far the most significant criterion by which success was measured was unquestionably victory. To some extent this reflects the popular desire for protection from the ravages of war, both foreign and civil, and for the security and peace that the emperor's victories might secure. The centrality of the representation of success in the prevailing symbolism is manifested in the constant references on the coinage and inscriptions to the emperor's victoriousness and to benefits that his victories made possible.[2]

The third feature is the special relationship with the divine; this was represented as a relationship between the emperor and the gods or godhead in general or as a relationship between the emperor and one or more deities in particular.[3] The special relationship between the emperor and the divine is already implicit in his relationship with victory, which lay in the gift of the gods. It is through victory above all that the emperor is represented as especially favoured by the gods: he is marked as their chosen champion to further the glorious destiny of Rome; and it is through his piety towards the gods that the emperor earns their assistance.[4]

The fourth feature of the symbolism of this period is repetition. The same symbolic imagery is constantly reiterated with only subtle variations; not just the same titles and insignia, but the same wider spectrum of symbolic representation appears again and again both within a reign and carried over from reign to reign. Titles were granted to the emperor over and over again, each new occasion being enumerated in the material sources: this applies particularly to those titles connected directly with victory, the cognomina victoriarum and the acclamation imperator.[5]

The fifth is amplification and hyperbole, which must be understood as reflecting an inflationary tendency in this symbolism, arising partly from its characteristically repetitive nature.[6] One aspect of this feature is the constant use of superlatives in the imperial titulature: not only in such titles as victoriosissimus and invictissimus but in the use of the term maximus, applied as a matter of course to almost all the imperial cognomina victoriarum at this time and also used on its own or in conjunction with other superlatives.[7] Another strand of this feature is the representation of the emperor's successes in war and peace as eternal.[8]

The sixth feature which has emerged from the survey is the strong showing, especially in coin iconography and in the more exaggerated titles on inscriptions, of elements adopted or adapted from Hellenistic royal symbolism.[9] In

part, the appearance of imitatio Alexandri in the symbolic representation of imperial authority in our period is inextricably linked to the association with the divine and the emphasis on victory which we have already noted. Equally it must be understood that, in the eastern part of the empire at least, the representation of imperial authority through the use of Hellenistic royal symbolism is a manifestation of the prevailing response to overwhelming political power which had developed in this area over many centuries.[10]

The seventh and most insistent feature of this symbolism is the emphasis placed upon continuity. This feature is both a cause and a natural corollary of the repetitive and hyperbolic nature of the symbolism; more than this, it is fundamental to the complex structure of the symbolism as a whole. Not only do we find an emphasis on continuity from one reign to the next, as we might perhaps expect, but there is also a much deeper-running sense of continuity, amounting to a justification of the present by reference to the past. This manifests itself partly in a constant stream of references back to past emperors, to the extent of apparently deliberate "borrowings" from predecessors both in the epigraphic titulature and in the symbolic representations on the coinage. Significantly, these numismatic "borrowings", and also the use of the formulaic titles we noted on inscriptions, tend to look back most often to the Antonine and Severan eras: that is, to the period that was generally recognized from the perspective

of the mid-third century as being the last period of great prosperity and security.[11] It also manifests itself as an association of the reigning emperor (partially via his predecessors) with the eternal destiny of Rome, stretching back to its mythical foundation, through references to Venus and Mars, Romulus and Remus and Roma Aeterna herself.[12] It is in the context of this overriding sense of continuity that we must understand the emphasis on restitution in the mid-third century symbolism: the emperor is represented as responsible for the restoration of the army, for the rehabilitation of Roman military glory, for the restoration of peace and security to the empire, or to parts thereof, and for making possible the return of the "Golden Age"; in effect, the complete restitution of the (Roman) world. In this way the emperor is represented as the (re-)founder of the empire.[13]

The quintessence of this emphasis on continuity - so important a feature of the symbolism that it requires a special mention - is the notion of Augustus as the paradigm of imperial authority. This feature not only reflects but in a crucial sense epitomizes all the other features we have noted. As we have seen, the title which most accurately signifies a senior emperor in the mid-third century is "Augustus". Overall the symbolic representation of imperial authority in this period, conveyed by the verbal and iconographic imagery on the coins and inscriptions of these reigns, remains unequivocally traditional. The tradition and even much of

what we might term innovative in the material we have surveyed points directly or indirectly to Augustus; indeed, the symbolic representation of imperial authority in the mid-third century is effectively incomprehensible without reference to imitatio Augusti.[14]

ii) Comparison of the symbolism used for the western and central emperors

One further point which emerges from the above investigation is the degree of correspondence between the symbolic representations of authority employed for those emperors who did and those who did not achieve senatorial recognition. Neither the continuity of mint personnel nor the innate conservatism of such symbolism is adequate to explain the degree of correlation we have found. For it is not simply that the symbolism used for the western emperors copies that which prevailed immediately before the revolt of Postumus: as we have seen, there were references back to earlier imperial traditions and there were also variations introduced under the western emperors which reflected changes we noted elsewhere at this date.[15] Moreover, the degree of experimentation within the traditional symbolism introduced to the coin imagery under the western emperors is no greater than one finds among the emperors whose authority was accepted at Rome in the mid-third century.

To judge from the titulature attributed to the western emperors on their coins and inscriptions, there is nothing to suggest that the authority they sought to exercise was anything but the customary authority of Roman emperors.[16] Indeed the overriding impression given by the whole spectrum of the symbolic representation of their authority on their coins and inscriptions is that the western emperors were perceived (even, probably, by themselves) as Roman emperors: as far as the evidence we have been surveying goes, therefore, they must be understood as Gegenkaiser and not as the rulers of a Sonderreich.

This conclusion is not in itself particularly surprising, indeed the use of the traditions of Roman imperial symbolism by the western emperors has never really been questioned. The problem is rather how significant this use is in the present context; in spite of the symbolic representations we have seen here, were these emperors really separatists after all? The answer to this question falls into two halves. First we must reconsider the few outstanding arguments which remain in support of the separatist thesis. Even though the tide of scholarly opinion has for some years now been moving away from the separatist interpretation of these events, the insistence with which this interpretation has been championed heretofore, as well as the relevance of this entire debate to the question of legitimacy and usurpation in the third century, compel us to review the case once more. Secondly we must, in the light of our findings,

reconsider the significance of the symbolism we have reviewed in relation to the nature and workings of imperial authority in the third century and beyond. The discussion of these points will help us to a better understanding of the true relationship between the phenomenon of usurpation and the legitimation of Roman imperial authority in the mid-third century. This in turn will permit a long-overdue revision of the rightful position of the third century within the history of the Roman empire.

5.b Gallic Separatism Reconsidered

1) Separatist elements in the symbolic representation

The use of standard titulature and iconography for the western emperors which we noted in their coinage and inscriptions, together with the numerous instances of numismatic evocation of the imperial past, would seem to argue against the separatist thesis. Besides these, however, there are also certain elements within the symbolic representation of these emperors which might be held to indicate a parochial rather than an empire-wide political platform. These refer to specifically local concerns or local deities.

It is important in this context to distinguish between appeal to local concerns and limited political ambition.

For example, coins mentioning victoria germanica or giving the emperor the title Restitutor Galliarum do not suggest separatism for Postumus any more than they do for Gallienus. There might have been a slightly different case to be made for Postumus' reverse type SALVS PROVINCIARVM, depicting the personification of the Rhine, which were among the very earliest of his reign. For all its novelty and parochial flavour, however, this type was too isolated and too short-lived to sustain a separatist interpretation: it must rather be understood as a variation on the well established theme of imperial care for local interests expressed elsewhere on the coinage of these emperors and of other emperors of the period who were recognized at Rome. Conversely, there are several instances of imperial titles on the coinage of the western emperors which apparently suggest the very opposite of separatism through their reference to the whole (Roman) world.[17]

The vast majority of the divine personae represented on the coinage and inscriptions of the western emperors are drawn from the standard Roman pantheon which regularly graces the coins and inscriptions of Roman emperors at this date. The only references to specifically local deities here are to two separate local cults, both assimilated to Hercules, in which the god bears the epithets Deusoniensis and Magusanus. Apart from the names, we know very little about these two cults, not even their exact locations. The former cult is associated

exclusively with Postumus; it is not attested elsewhere than on his coinage, where it played a dominant role (above, 4.b). The latter is attested on a few inscriptions, the distribution of which leads one to suspect the lower Rhine as the centre of the cult. Why the unknown Hercules Deusoniensis was very much favoured over the established Magusanus, where precisely Deuso may have been, what the nature of Postumus' connection with these cults and their localities was and whether there is some direct correlation between the locality of these cults and the ethnic origin of the troops under his command, are all matters of speculation. The extant inscriptions elsewhere that mention Hercules Magusanus at least suggest a military connection.[18] A possible clue in support of a military connection may be given by another similar mention of a regional cult on the coinage of this period: the IO(vi) CANTAB(rorum) type issued under Gallienus, probably in honour of Cantabrian cavalry troops stationed in the Balkans. With these coins at least there can be no reason to infer latent separatism.[19]

To offset these references to specifically local deities, we should also recall that Postumus issued several coin types which refer to Hercules with the epithet Romanus.[20] Two other deities of special interest to us in this present context, since they apparently link the western emperors directly to the destiny of Rome, are Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Dea Roma. The references to Jupiter in his specifically Capitoline form and the

various associations drawn on the coinage of these emperors with Dea Roma, which are more frequent than previously supposed, would seem to argue against a separatist programme.[21]

ii) "Gallicism" as a factor in western separatism

The issue of "separatism" in the western provinces between 260 and 274 has become clouded by notions of "Gallic" identity. The conventional designation of these events as a "Gallic Empire" is largely derived from a specious comparison between the events in the mid-third century and the disturbances in Gaul during AD 68-70.[22] One idea behind this comparison is the important role attributed to the Batavi in the third-century events, for these people were the strongest supporters of the earlier revolt, and indeed Civilis himself had been a Batavian. Furthermore there is a generally accepted supposition that Postumus and indeed all, or at least most, of the protagonists in the so-called "Gallic Empire" were of specifically "Gallic" origin. The evidence is largely conjectural and in the context of this inquiry therefore somewhat circular: Postumus' reputed connections with the Batavi, for example, has undoubtedly been influenced by the comparison with Civilis.[23]

Although some slight evidence does exist to suggest a western (but not exclusively Gallic) origin for several of the principal actors in these events, this fact requires

no elaborate "Gallic separatist" explanation. Local recruitment was standard, and promotion through the ranks was common at this date, facilitated by exigencies which brought men of military background to the highest positions of command (including, of course, emperor). Since military events had a high profile during these fourteen years, the advancement of men of western origin within the western provinces is scarcely remarkable; still less so when we recall that the emperors based in Gaul did not have access to the rest of the empire in which to exercise their patronage. Therefore, even if we allow the patria of all those who played a prominent role in these events to lie within the territory which supported Postumus' revolt, this does not suggest a deliberately separatist programme on their part, still less one based on some notional "Gallic" identity.[24]

Another aspect of the idea of a "Gallic Empire", lies in the nature of the support the emperors enjoyed in Gaul. The Historia Augusta asserts that these emperors enjoyed the unqualified support of the "Gallic peoples", adding that these peoples were a troublesome and wayward lot who enjoyed subverting the authority of Rome. This is scarcely a testimony by which to put much store, not least because it belongs to a tradition compiled from a Roman perspective after the reunification of the empire. Once again this perspective relies heavily on the comparison with events from other periods: not only those of two centuries before, but also those of a century later.[25]

This is not to deny that Postumus and those that succeeded him enjoyed a considerable measure of popular support, though in practice there is no way to judge the extent of such support. The distribution of the inscriptions which recognize the western emperors give an indication of the geographical area over which these emperors held sway, but they do not tell us about the depth of the allegiance involved, still less its underlying motives. It is likely that western provincials saw in Postumus and his successors leaders who would satisfy their needs, above all the need for security, more fully than would other contenders elsewhere. This does not in any way suggest that these needs were perceived in terms of the creation of a separate, autonomous and territorially self-contained state.[26]

A more significant flaw in the argument for a link between Gallic support and an explicitly "Gallic" separatism can be seen in the fact that support for these emperors was by no means coextensive with Gaul (even if, by this, one means the three Gauls and the two Germanies). In the first place, at least parts of the provinces of Spain and Britain acknowledged Postumus, and while it is true that Spain reverted to Claudius on (or about) the death of Postumus, Britain apparently remained loyal to Postumus' successors at least well into Tetricus' reign. Furthermore, under Tetricus at least the western part of Narbonensis owed allegiance to him, while the eastern part of the same province remained loyal to the central

emperors.[27] In the second place, support was by no means even or constant within the Gallic region. Arguing from the lack of epigraphic evidence in certain areas cannot tell us much, but the revolt of the Aedui against Victorinus (in favour of Claudius) at least suggests that the western emperors could not count on the wholehearted allegiance of all tres provinciae Galliae. It was only after a long siege by the Rhine army loyal to Victorinus that Autun was compelled to return once more to his fold.[28]

All this not only makes it difficult to speak of a "Gallic Empire" ruled over by "Gallic emperors", but even undermines the notion of what has been termed "un Empire romain transposé aux limites territoriales de la Gaule", or an "Empire romain des Gaules".[29] Nor are there sufficient grounds to believe that Postumus "se considère comme Empereur des Gaules".[30] In such modern descriptions, the ill-defined concepts of regional, local and "Gallic" identity have become confused with the sentiments of patriotism if not actually of nationalism.

"Nationalism" is, of course, an entirely anachronistic notion; but even "patriotism" was essentially a rather localized affair in the Roman empire, as is made abundantly clear, for instance, in the nature of the Aeduan revolt and its subsequent reports in the Latin Panegyrics.[31] Even while accepting that the concept of "nationalism" as such could not have affected the

attitudes of those who took part in these events, certain scholars have allowed something very like it to infuse their own attitudes to these events. It is perhaps more than a coincidence, therefore, that the scholars who have most strongly advocated the theory of a specifically "Gallic" separatism have tended to be those whose own origins lie within the territory of this supposedly distinct empire; in particular, support for this interpretation has been suspiciously strong among French scholars.[32] One is obliged to conclude that the notion of a specifically "Gallic" Sonderreich is in fact a modern invention and that the entire issue of "Gallicism" is at best a distraction.

iii) The evidence for a separate "Gallic senate"

It has been suggested that, in order to facilitate the secession of the western provinces from the Roman empire, the western emperors set up a rival senate in Gaul, modelled on but totally independent of that in Rome. The notion rests primarily upon the presence of the letters SC on the bronze coinage of Postumus. These letters, it is argued, usually connote senatorial endorsement of the issues thus marked, but since Postumus' rule itself never received the endorsement of the senate at Rome, they could hardly have sanctioned his bronze issues. It follows that the letters SC on the bronze coinage of Postumus must

refer instead to the endorsement of a separate senate which he himself had created in Gaul.

This theory, set out most forcefully by Alföldi, is attractive for two reasons. First, it offers an explanation for the set of ordinary (that is eponymous) consuls, including the western emperors themselves, who were recognized in the western provinces during these fourteen years and who, as the epigraphic record proves, were quite distinct from those registered in the official fasti at Rome. As the consulship normally implied at least ex officio membership of the senate, and as there is little reason to credit most of these "western" consuls with prior membership of the senate at Rome, it has been readily assumed that these same individuals must belong to a separate senate convened by the western emperors in their new Gallic capital. Secondly, it reinforces the old constitutionalist dichotomy of legitimate emperor/usurper by assuming that the western emperors must have required the formal recognition of a senate in default of that of the senate.[33]

There can be no doubt, however, that the existence of such a "senate" is no more than a conjecture put forward to explain the facts outlined above; as an explanation it is both unlikely and unnecessary. The use of the letters SC on the bronze coinage is better explained as part of the wholesale adoption of the symbolism traditionally associated with Roman imperial authority. Indeed the

connection between the letters SC and senatorial authority on the imperial bronzes of any period is doubtful. In this present context, at least, it is best understood in terms of the continuity in the symbolic representation of the period combined with the conservatism of the medium. Similarly, conformity to the normal imperial pattern of the period lies behind Postumus' appointment of himself and a colleague as the ordinary consuls for January 261, for even the fact that this consulship was taken in absentia was not a violation of this tradition. Where Postumus' action differed from the norm was that he had not first secured the recognition of the city of Rome where the fasti were kept. The inhabitants of the western provinces who accepted the authority of Postumus and his successors as the emperor would, as a matter of course, have accepted the western emperors and their nominees as the consuls. Postumus' arrogation of the ordinary consulship therefore quite naturally inaugurated a rival dating system which was bound to persist, of its own momentum, as long as Postumus' imperial claim, or that of his successors, remained undefeated and yet unrecognized at Rome. The problem here is in fact one of our own historical perspective, which is far too legalistic and far too Romanocentric: the use of SC on the bronze coinage, the rival set of consuls and indeed all the other lesser anomalies of this kind can more satisfactorily be explained by regarding them as a natural outcome of the western emperors' exploitation of Roman imperial custom as

if they had been recognized at Rome. There are certainly no substantial grounds for believing in the existence of a separate "western" senate as such.[34]

iv) The evidence for deliberate political partition

We have no hard evidence for the representation of a separatist programme nor for any specifically "Gallic" identity in these events. This leaves us with the bare fact of the existence of the two sets of emperors recognized in different parts of the empire over the same period of time. During these fourteen years an uneasy military stand-off persisted between the western and the central emperors, apparently interrupted only once when Gallienus led a brief and inconclusive campaign against Postumus, in the mid 260s, but was forced to withdraw, apparently due to his being seriously wounded. Neither the stand-off itself nor the abrupt cessation of hostilities on the one occasion when they had broken out can be taken as evidence of any formal arrangement to partition the empire between the two parties directly. Rather what we find is a policy on both sides amounting to wary mutual containment: the stationing of Aureolus at Milan under Gallienus and of Placidianus in Narbonensis under Claudius and Aurelian exemplify this policy, as does Claudius' non-intervention in the Aeduan revolt.[35] There is absolutely no evidence, such as we might expect to find on the coinage of one or other side, to suggest the kind

of mutual accommodation that had been reached between Septimius and Albinus, or even the kind of unilateral recognition which Carausius was later to apply to Diocletian and Maximianus.

There are, however, two other individuals with whom the western emperors may have come to an arrangement to partition the empire in such a way as to allow the devolution of the western provinces. According to one theory, coins with the legend ORIENS AVGG issued by Regalian imply that he had reached an understanding with Postumus whereby he himself would rule the eastern half of the empire, leaving the western provinces for Postumus (to whom, according to this hypothesis, the second "G" of AVGG referred). The hypothesis is at best fanciful and has been convincingly demolished.[36]

The other theoretical accomplice was Gallienus' brilliant if unreliable general Aureolus, who according to the literary tradition was suspected of treachery prior to his eventual revolt at Milan. Whether this refers to Aureolus' half-hearted prosecution of the afore-mentioned campaign against Postumus, or even to a secret deal between the two at that time, there is insufficient evidence to say. One thing, however, does now seem clear: when Aureolus finally did revolt in Milan at the end of Gallienus' reign, he apparently issued coinage in the name of Postumus. Even if we are to recognize in this act the outcome of some prearrangement between these two, such an

agreement does not particularly imply territorial partition of the Roman empire. On the contrary, the strong implication is that Aureolus submitted himself and his troops to Postumus' authority and recognized him (in place of Gallienus) as sole ruler. The most likely explanation for this action, therefore, is not some form of political partition, but a unilateral decision on the part of Aureolus to throw in his lot with Postumus as being his enemy's enemy.[37]

In point of fact, therefore, the evidence for such arrangements of political partition, intended to effect a kind of western seccession, is as flimsy as that for all the rest of the suppositions upon which the notion of separatism has been based. For what it is worth, with the possible exception of the passage of Eutropius mentioned above, the literary sources lend little support to the idea of a secessionist "Gallic empire". It is perhaps better (for once) to accept the testimony of the Historia Augusta, for all that it stems from a hopeless bias against Gallienus, that Postumus and his successors, far from being separatists, were actually adsertores Romani nominis. In so doing we are not obliged to regard Postumus as a saint who placed the good of the Roman empire above his personal ambition; we are obliged, however, to make serious adjustments to our view of the context in which Postumus had to calculate how best to serve his personal ambition.[38]

Taking all the evidence together, therefore, it can be seen that the case for Gallic or western separatism does not stand up to scrutiny. The consequences of this conclusion for our investigation of usurpation and legitimation in the mid-third century are profound.

5.c Beyond Separatism: Conventions of Legitimacy

For almost a decade and a half, a series of individuals were able to assume the titles, insignia and prerogatives appropriate to a Roman emperor. They issued coinage, for all intents and purposes corresponding to the coinage produced previously in the Roman empire (even down to deliberate mimicking of previous types) and to that which continued to be produced elsewhere in the empire at this time. They were able to assume command of Roman legions, conduct wars and make peace, like any other emperor (and indeed, more successfully than most in this period). They could appoint not only themselves but others to the highly prestigious consulship (and no doubt to many other important posts and offices besides). In exercising this imperial prerogative they succeeded in binding to themselves men who thereby had a vested interest in supporting their claims to the imperial authority (the authority by which they had acquired that prerogative). In short, in every respect they exercised the authority of

a Roman emperor, but exclusively within an area of the western provinces without ever being recognized at Rome.[39]

During this same period other individuals conducted themselves in much the same manner elsewhere in the empire, and of these, four in particular - Gallienus, Claudius, Quintillus and Aurelian - were recognized by the senate at Rome. The fact that different emperors were recognized in different parts of the Roman empire at the same time is not in itself problematic and requires no special explanation; indeed it was commonplace in this period of frequent usurpation. The problems arise only with the duration of the division of loyalties between those who recognized the central emperors and those who gave their allegiance to the western emperors and with the apparent willingness by both parties to accept this de facto division. Since we have found that the separatist argument will not stand, the only alternative explanation is one of pragmatism.

We have already noted that, due to the internal insecurities and external military threats, the central emperors evidently considered that the risk involved in marching against their western rivals was simply too great, preferring on the whole to concentrate on holding their precarious position in the rest of the empire while containing the potential menace that the western emperors posed without acknowledging their authority (above 5.b). A similar and reciprocal pragmatism must be credited to

Postumus and his successors. Not once during these years, as far as the evidence can testify, did any of the western emperors make a serious attempt to march on Rome in order to make good their claims. Postumus must have perceived the risks involved in a march on Rome as outweighing the reward. In choosing to remain in Gaul, he not only thought to defend the province against the raids of the transrhenane tribes, but to prevent himself being cut off in the rear by further coups like his own. For nine years his gambit paid off, and even on his death his comparative success in turn allowed his position to be taken up by others and perpetuated. It may be that for the later western emperors the situation had acquired a certain inertia of its own which must have acted as an additional deterrent to invading Italy.[40]

In accepting this pragmatic interpretation as the only alternative to the separatist explanation, we must recognize that it entails an apparent shift in perspective. Until Postumus' revolt in 260 it had always seemed more or less axiomatic that an imperial contender would seek the recognition of Rome, by force of arms if necessary. For Postumus to have seen the situation differently implies a highly significant shift in the balance between the risk and the reward involved in marching on Rome. This might be because the risks were perceived to be higher, or the reward of less value, or both. Postumus' comparatively long-lived "success" not only in maintaining his political authority for many

years, but in appropriating explicitly Roman imperial authority, apparently demonstrates that it was feasible at that time to rule a large area of the Roman empire, as a Roman emperor, without the recognition of the senate at Rome.[41]

The rejection of the separatist explanation leads us back to the wider issues of legitimacy and usurpation with which we began (above, Chapter 1.b). If Postumus and his successors were not attempting to set up an independent empire, their pragmatism in ignoring the verdict of Rome places the debate on the meaning of usurpation and legitimacy in the mid-third century in a very different light. In falling to take adequate account of this complex relationship between usurpation and legitimation, the conventional approach, with its dichotomy between "legitimate emperors" and "usurpers" and its strong caesura, obscures the significance of the third century in the overall development of imperial authority.

The overwhelming message of the numismatic and epigraphic evidence, a message that is not contradicted by the literary sources, is that legitimation in the mid-third century could actually be meaningful without the recognition of the senate at Rome (or indeed any other "senate"). That these emperors were able to maintain their claim to Roman imperial authority for so long, without ever gaining political control of Rome, was to have crucially important repercussions for the future

development of Roman political power in Europe and the Mediterranean.

More importantly for the matter in hand, this situation has particularly significant implications for the study of the symbolic representation of Roman imperial authority. Postumus' assumption of the standard titulature appropriate to Roman imperial authority, like his exercise of the prerogative to designate the consuls, and even the appearance of the mark SC on his bronze coinage, indicates with great clarity that these symbols of his authority had a much looser correlation with imperial power than a purely legalistic interpretation allows for. Just as the SC on his bronze coinage had more to do with the "look" of Roman imperial bronze coinage than with notions of senatorial endorsement, so the style "consul" or "pontifex maximus" had more to do with the symbolic imagery of imperial authority than with individual offices. It was not that Postumus' rebellion, through a conscious break with Rome, artificially created the circumstances in which this use of the symbolism became possible; it was rather that this facet of imperial symbolism in the mid-third century made it possible for Postumus "successfully" to adopt such Roman imperial symbolism without reference to the physical city of Rome, its offices of state or its senate.[42]

The conventional way of viewing Roman imperial authority is both too static and too strongly bound by narrowly

constitutionalist interpretations. It concentrates on the literal and legalistic aspects, without taking adequate account of the context in which imperial authority was operating at the time. In truth the usefulness of the dichotomy of legitimacy based upon the sole criterion of senatorial recognition is stretched beyond all credible limits by the career of Postumus, and to a lesser degree also by those of certain other third-century pretenders. If we are to make any meaningful progress in our comprehension of the mid-third century, we must find a quite different approach that does not rely upon this conventional dichotomy. It has become increasingly clear that the imperial contenders of the mid-third century cannot in any simple fashion be divided into two distinct groups according to the ultimate "success" (however defined) of their ventures. We must recognize that it is quite impossible to treat the succession of usurpations in the mid-third century as a series of unconnected incidents, springing from the ambitions of individual candidates or any other such idiosyncratic circumstance. We should see them rather as part of an integral phenomenon.

Several scholars dealing with the complex issues of this period have recently attempted to incorporate this understanding into their approach. Unfortunately, these efforts have not been carried far enough.[43] Although the simplistic model suggested by the Principate/Dominate terminology has now been rejected by many, the ideas

embedded in it continue to exercise a profound influence. This is partly due to the very real requirements of historical analysis. In order to make the past more accessible, historians have always divided it up into temporal blocks. This periodization is both natural and desirable, but there is a price to pay: such temporal blocks are liable to become more or less self-contained. Often this results in an exaggeration of the internal uniformity accorded to each of the two periods on either side of the divide and a corresponding minimalization of the continuity from one period to the next. Though the presence of such a stark break in the history of the Roman empire at the point marked by the lacuna is understandable, it is also regrettable, since the effects of the "tunnel" and the caesura are mutually reinforcing, as we have seen.

At the same time, the persistence of the old model is partly due to a particularly persuasive kind of inertia. Old patterns of perception die hard, and a declaration of inadequacy is rarely enough to finish them off. In spite of a general dissatisfaction with the limitations of the traditional approach, scholars of Roman history have seldom taken adequate account of the constraints imposed on one's thinking by longstanding patterns of thought. Thus, among scholars writing in English the explicit use of the terms "Principate" and "Dominate" has outwardly lost ground in favour of the more neutral "Early Empire" and "Late Empire". To a great extent in practice,

however, the change in terminology has merely masked how much the traditional sentiments have persisted. This persistence is more openly acknowledged in German scholarship, where the old terminology is to a greater degree still current; similarly the traditional French terminology (le Haut-Empire, le Bas-Empire), while it is prima facie no more than a simple periodization, also remains intrinsically loaded. While the underlying ideas of the traditional approach remain essentially unchallenged, the shift in terminology (in recent English-speaking scholarship at least) has actually made it harder to bring about effective change in the attitudes people actually bring to bear on the subject. Once the cosmetic changes have become generally accepted, to press for a genuine change of attitude is all the more difficult and can lead to charges of flogging a dead horse. The mechanism by which this ironic mind game operates, together with its academic implications, were pointed out by Arthur Koestler in his brief study "On Not Flogging Dead Horses".[44] The challenge before us is, therefore, to find a way of analysing the political upheavals of the mid-third century without the constraints of the traditional approach.

CHAPTER 6

BREAKING THE MOULD:

TRANSCENDING THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

Modern scholarship has not found it easy to accept the implications of the essential parity of Postumus with any other Roman emperor who had seized power by force in this period, such as Valerian or Aurelian. Given the fundamental importance of these implications for the understanding of usurpation and legitimation in the third century, how can one account for this reticence? To answer this we must consider the nature of the historiographical tradition within which the history of imperial Rome has been written, both by ancient and by modern writers. This chapter examines the relationship between authority and legitimation: first (6a, 6b), according to the conventional view which has constrained the traditional historiography; secondly (6c), in the light of recent sociological research.

6.a The Senatorial Viewpoint

The conventional approach to Roman imperial authority and to the nature of legitimacy, with which the evidence we have been considering appears to be at odds, owes a

great deal to the values and beliefs expressed in the surviving literary sources and to the ways in which these have been incorporated into the structure of western education over the last few centuries. Before we can hope to tackle the problems of imperial authority in the third century we must, therefore, consider how it is that this historiographical tradition came to take the form it has and what its significance is for our present undertaking.

1) The senatorial scheme of values

The later writers whose accounts have formed the basis of our understanding of the third century, principally the Greek and Latin historians and chroniclers from Cassius Dio and Herodian in the early third century through Aurelius Victor, Eutropius and the author (if not authors) of the infamous Historia Augusta in the fourth century to Zosimus and others later still, shared a surprisingly consistent outlook on the world they described. This was not simply because for the most part they came from reasonably similar social backgrounds, but because they were all writing within a given literary tradition. This tradition consisted of works written by individuals who either belonged to or identified themselves with the Roman senate; more significantly still, the readership at whom these works were addressed would have been drawn almost exclusively from this exact social stratum. The

prevalling vlew expressed in this tradition may therefore, for the sake of convenience, be termed "senatorial".[1]

The vlewpoint expressed in this senatorial tradition was redolent with judgements based on a tacitly assumed scheme of values, reflecting the prejudices and aspirations of the empire's educated elite, which influenced both the choice of subject matter and its treatment. These values were articulated through a complex skein of rhetoric. In origin this "rhetoric" was far from disingenuous: an effective formulation of a particular set of ideas rather than a mere cynical manipulation of words. Due to the the highly traditional educational system, however, this outlook remained substantially unaltered for centuries. As the social structure of the Roman empire gradually changed, the rhetoric became increasingly removed from the reality it was intended to qualify; that is to say it became increasingly rhetorical in the colloquial sense of the word. These values were inseparably bound up with a conceptual identity which we may term the senatorial ideals of Romanity. This protean concept had little to do with nationality; rather it expressed an attitude of mind and a code of practice (derived ultimately from the same roots as Cicero's concept of mos maiorum). The ideals of Romanity could be easily equated with "civilization" itself (as defined by the writers themselves: that is from the perspective of the urban elites of the Mediterranean heartland of the empire). The scheme of values that was perpetuated in this tradition had two determinant

characteristics: first, it was inherently conservative, looking back to the past, sometimes to a distant, even semi-mythical past, for its models; secondly, it regarded the Roman senate as the repository and indeed the very embodiment of its most cherished ideals.

The cultural elitism implied in this rhetoric, which tended to disparage the contributions of outsiders (especially "uncouth northerners" and "degenerate easterners"), had continued and even intensified as the empire had developed, a process which had occurred against the backdrop of an ever-increasing influence of the peoples and cultures of the north and east over the centre. As the number of senators who came from the northern and eastern parts of the empire became proportionately more significant, the continuity in the senatorial rhetoric became more paradoxical.[2] The complexities of this problem owe a great deal to the way in which the provincial elites sought to gain local prestige within their own communities by associating themselves with the ruling Roman senatorial elite. This association encouraged the provincial elites to align their values with the senatorial ideals of Romanity, and thereby allow the latter to stand for the conceptual unity of the empire. This provided a powerful incentive for the fostering and promotion of the senatorial rhetoric.[3]

ii) The idea of "liberty"

The articulation of the senatorial viewpoint must be understood above all as an assertion of what the elite had always taken to be its rightful place of pre-eminence in the political structure of the empire. This pervasive pattern of thought regarded the senate as the champion of two cherished and concomitant ideals, libertas and res publica. Traditionally it had placed the highest premium upon the preservation of the auctoritas and dignitas of the senate as a corporate body by anathematizing dominatio by any individual member.[4] Although it addressed issues of safeguarding personal civic rights and the public interests, it had never been remotely egalitarian; often vociferously anti-monarchical, it was equally anti-democratic. Its principal concern was the quintessentially aristocratic issue of preserving the political and social standing of the elite, and the personal freedom of action and privileges of its members.[5]

This perspective is common to all the most influential authors of the senatorial tradition from the republic on down through the empire.[6] Under the empire, however, it had required some significant adjustment. The disruption which the very existence of an emperor had caused to this ideology had come to be contained by incorporating the new political reality within the rhetoric so as to preserve the self-esteem of the elite. This was effected in two ways which, though seemingly incompatible, were often used simultaneously. Either the position of the emperor was presented as dependent upon the authority of the senate,

thereby seeming to restrict his power within constitutional bounds, or the absolute power of the emperor was openly admitted, even while placing the greatest stress upon the emperor's deference to the senate. According to these two versions, an emperor who disregarded or offended the senate, or who was seen to depart from or subvert the senatorial ideals, was acting either beyond his "legitimate competence" or simply in bad taste. In either case, the least palatable consequences of imperial power could be denounced as the wicked foibles of wayward individual emperors, rather than demonstrations of the senate's weakness.[7] In the early empire an emperor who acted thus was liable to have his rule branded with the name of "tyranny", a virtual antonym of "liberty".[8]

By presenting the "tyrant" as an aberration the senatorial rhetoric could plausibly embrace the "principate" as a system in which the emperor was the leading senator whose civilitas in his dealings with the senate proved him to be the foremost champion of libertas and res publica.[9] Since these two ideals were highly relative terms, there was no contradiction in presenting the reign of Augustus as the triumph of libertas when contrasted with the licentia in the period of civil war that preceded it. Similarly Tacitus could claim that Nerva had reconciled the previously incompatible notions of libertas and principatus, and emperors such as Antoninus and Marcus could be admired for their defence of senatorial ideals.[10]

During the first three centuries of the Roman empire the senatorial monopoly of military commands was gradually eroded and an increasingly large proportion of the senate ceased to have the military experience that had once been an integral part of the senatorial career.[11] The divorce, which by the mid-third century was almost total, between the senatorial elite and an increasingly professional (and eventually largely mercenary) army allowed the later senatorial writers to draw a stark dichotomy between military and civilian that would have been meaningless, if not impossible, earlier. Their complaints against the brutality and greed of the soldiery and the folly of emperors who encouraged it by giving large donatives were not without foundation. Nevertheless, their growing distrust of the army and of military intervention in the political arena must be understood in relation to the broader context of their outlook and their diminishing access to military power.[12]

iii) The idea of "decline"

Across a wide spectrum of fields in antiquity, including artistic, literary and educational as well as political matters, the retrospective nature of the senatorial outlook had always encouraged the presumption of a general state of decline.[13] The writers of the later imperial period, imbued with the senatorial perspective, were filled with a morbid retrospection tinged with nostalgia;

they came to view the senate itself as the last bastion of their beleaguered values against what was presented as the corruption of an ever less "civilized" (that is less senatorial) imperial despotism. The "decline" they perceived in the political field was measured almost exclusively in terms of the gradual erosion of the privileged status and political power of the senatorial elite. The later senatorial writers explained the ideological rift between emperor and senate which resulted from the increasing dislocation of their own rhetoric from the social, political and military realities of the day by contrasting their own times with the past in terms of a "decline". One of the earliest examples of the articulation of this view, and also perhaps the most succinct and the most graphic, was expressed by Cassius Dio.[14]

As the dislocation between the static rhetoric and the dynamic reality grew ever more substantial, the discourse was employed simultaneously to deny and to compensate for the changing actuality. One of the principal accusations levelled at the emperors of the latter half of the third century was that their appearance and behaviour was out of keeping with the senatorial ideals and that above all their treatment of the senate lacked the necessary degree of <u>civilitas</u>.[15] By the time the writers of the later senatorial tradition came to look back at the plethora of imperial claimants in the third century, they had narrowed their rhetorical formulation of the distinction between

princeps and tyrannus down to the single criterion of senatorial recognition as a reflection of imperial deference to the senate.[16]

The values and prejudices incorporated in the senatorial tradition have come to exercise an extraordinary influence upon the conventional understanding of Roman imperial history in our own day. They have affected our understanding of authority and legitimation and have encouraged a distorted view of the "decline and fall" of the Roman empire. In order to set aside the more harmful aspects of this influence, we must briefly trace the course of this legacy.

6.b Prejudice and Tradition in the Current Attitudes Prevailing in the Historiography of Imperial Rome

1) The cultural and intellectual context

The bias of the senatorial viewpoint has presented us with historiographical problems which have been greatly exacerbated through the heavy reliance traditionally placed upon the literary evidence in the modern study of ancient history. At least until comparatively recently in the traditional structure of western education, the study of ancient history has been regarded as a subdivision of the classics: historical inquiry was intended to provide a better understanding of the classical texts, rather than

the classical texts functioning as a tool of historical inquiry. Although scholarship in recent decades has turned more often and with increasing benefit to other types of evidence, the legacy of the text-based historiography remains decisive. At the same time the relationship between the modern historiographical tradition and the literary sources from antiquity must be seen as part of a highly complex cultural phenomenon, a vitally important part of which is the extraordinary fascination that the ancient world in general and Rome in particular have exercised over subsequent European and European-influenced cultures throughout the ages.

The generalized "Cult of Antiquity" which had arisen during the Renaissance gradually crystallized, under the constraints of the educational system of the following centuries, around a much narrower canon of works. The models of excellence, in art and literature, in philosophy and in politics, were drawn from what were regarded as the cultural apogees of Greece and Rome. The intertwining of these two concepts is clearly reflected in the evolution of the terms "classic(s)" and "classical".[17] The canon of works upon which the history of the Roman empire has very largely been based was not representative. Not only did it reflect the views of a small, if influential, minority in the Roman world comprising, as we have seen, the limited social stratum of the empire's educated elite, but it also favoured earlier works over later ones and works

which viewed the Roman world from the centre over those which reflected a more provincial point of view.

The view of the Roman empire which has predominated in the western educational establishment over most of the last few centuries has been to some degree moulded by wider cultural attitudes to the past. Steeped in the world of "classical" antiquity, the governing classes of Europe and its colonies came to view themselves as the direct cultural and political heirs of the Roman elite.[18] Over the last few centuries the great preponderance of those who have studied or written about the Roman empire have belonged to a class similar to that of the ancient authors whose texts they have studied, and have therefore tended to share the cultural and political prejudices contained in these texts. The primacy of what we may justifiably continue to term "senatorial" attitudes has constrained the development of modern political theory within rather narrowly "constitutionalist" bounds. As a result of the confluence of this view with the reliance upon the ancient senatorial sources, the historiographic tradition that has arisen on the political developments of the Roman empire, and in particular the role of the events of the third century within those developments, has suffered serious distortion.

The ancient senatorial conception of political authority in terms of a debate between "tyranny" and "liberty" has had a profound effect, not only upon the modern

historiography of the Roman empire, but upon modern political thought in general. Notions of personal and political rights, and the ideal of free men obedient to the law rather than to other men, have exercised a powerful and abiding influence in the modern world. As in the ancient rhetoric, such ideals were not regarded as pertaining to everyone: the meaning of the term "liberty" remained highly selective even as it has become fashionable among scholars and politicians alike over the last three hundred years.[19] Political power in general came to be seen in terms of the conventional perceptions of the classical past, as a struggle between "tyranny" and "liberty".[20] In the English and French speaking worlds in particular, this reiteration of the ancient rhetoric encouraged a climate of opinion which amounted to a mistrust of executive power.[21] At the same time, a divorce between civil and military power over the last few centuries, similar to that which developed under the Roman empire, has encouraged a distrust of military intervention in political affairs among modern Western political analysts similar to the prejudiced reaction found in the later writers of antiquity.[22]

ii) "Liberty" and "decline" in the modern historiographical tradition

Not surprisingly such a climate of opinion has been carried over into attitudes to the Roman imperial past,

where it has reinforced the prejudices existing in the ancient literary sources. Ideas of an aging empire, propped up by a rapacious and largely alien army, corrupted by "oriental" influence and ripe for destruction by barbarian invaders, have come to be commonplace among educated people today; the popular mythology, based partly on a legacy from the English Romantics of the nineteenth century, is even more lurid. Although both the ancient texts and the modern historiographical tradition have acknowledged the military achievements of the so-called "soldier-emperors", the situation which brought these same individuals to the fore, that is the situation that permitted what is sometimes presented as the total "militarization" of the government, and more especially of its chief executive, is inevitably abhorred as an element and a symptom of the political degeneracy of the Roman empire.[23] The conception that the Roman empire did eventually "fall", ever since it was first expounded in the Renaissance, has virtually demanded the existence of a period of "decline" leading up to this ultimate catastrophe. Although we have now begun to call into question the perceptions of both a "decline" and a "fall", in their traditional and straightforward senses, the weight of the tradition has rendered them difficult to remove. For too long the Roman empire has been held up as the ultimate proof of Lord Acton's overworked dictum, "power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely", its "decline and fall" used as an example to

warn against the corrupting evil of despotism everywhere.[24]

The conventional approach to imperial authority has thus become locked in a debate the language of which is almost entirely inherited from the ancient rhetoric of liberty. Nowhere is this debt more clearly shown than in the traditional approach to the history of the third century. The legacy of these attitudes has shaped an historiographical tradition in which Roman imperial power has been treated with a suspicion which could only be assuaged as long as the emperor's authority could be presented as constitutionally dependent upon the legal sanctions of the senate. The exercise of the emperor's autocratic power without reference to the senate could only be regarded as both an aberration and an abhorrence. When, from the end of the second century, such "abuses" of imperial authority became too common to be regarded as aberrant, and when, above all, from the middle of the third century the senate finally ceased to be in a political position to act as even a nominal constraint upon these excesses, the entire political system could be said to be in a state of degeneracy: the "crisis" was to be understood as a "catastrophe". In the conventional view of the modern historiographical tradition, therefore, the development of Roman imperial authority is represented as a degeneration from a morally justified and "legally sanctioned" monarchy, for the most part led by responsible (that is "senatorial") emperors epitomized by Antoninus

Pius and Marcus Aurellus, to the "absolutist" monarchy of the late empire. This view is inextricably linked with the tendency to view the later history of the Roman empire largely in terms of the gradual decline and eventual disintegration of "classical civilization".[25]

In practice the concept of decline is complex and subtle, involving quantitative and qualitative dimensions, the assessment of which is necessarily both relative and subjective.[26] In the Roman empire of the third and fourth centuries it is not possible to speak meaningfully of universal decline. Both geographically and across the spectrum of human activities such vague presumptions of decline are as untenable as they are unhelpful. Furthermore, subjective value judgements about decline have occasionally been applied from one field to another, implying a parallel without supplying plausible causal links. Such irresponsible cross-references, particularly prevalent in socio-political analyses of late Roman art, have done much to obscure the significant developments of the third century.[27]

The conception of the Roman empire in terms of a single dominant society embracing "classical" culture has been another of the problematic legacies of this senatorial rhetoric. Even to speak of "Roman society" is misleading: the Roman empire was not a tightly-knit homogeneous unit but a loose conglomerate of interlocking social networks. Some of these networks may be labelled "Roman" more

meaningfully than others. The conceptual unity of the empire was real enough, built up through a variety of political, social, economic and cultural channels; but the relationship between this conceptual unity and something that can be identified as "Roman" is far from straightforward. Expressions like "the Romanization of the provinces" are unhelpful because they imply a fixed quality "Roman" towards which the provincials were gradually being won over. The reality was very much more complex. The periphery and the centre combined to form something entirely new, and did so not once but in a continual process of successive recombinations. The term "Roman" should not be taken as a constant: it meant quite different things to different people in different contexts.[28]

It is clear that the historiographical tradition, with its longstanding assimilation of the ancient rhetorical concepts of "Romanity", "liberty" and "decline", has failed to do justice to the interrelationship between imperial authority and the processes of usurpation and legitimation under the Roman empire. The preservation of the ancient rhetoric has obscured the extent and the significance of the shifts in the political role of the elite, in the make-up and function of the senate and in the importance of the city of Rome. It has thereby disguised the changes in the social and political structure of the empire without reference to which the events of the third century are unintelligible. Above

all, the conventions of this tradition have perpetuated a narrowly constitutionalist approach to imperial authority at Rome which has been especially problematic for our understanding of the political developments of the mid-third century.

At the heart of the matter lies a confused and, in every sense, partial understanding of the key concepts involved: notably "power", "authority", "legitimacy" and "usurpation". In the essentially liberal traditions of western political thought there lurks a strong distrust of power (encapsulated by Acton's dictum). By limiting the scope of the term "power", this tradition has sought to deny the extensiveness of the phenomenon itself; "authority" is restricted to the "legitmate use of power", and the concept "legitimacy" itself has been shrunk to the equivalent of "legality". A fundamental reappraisal of the meaning and interrelation of these key concepts and their application to the field of Roman imperial history is long overdue.

6.c A General Analysis of Political Authority and Legitimation: the Symbolics of Power

Modern sociological research has been much concerned with the nature of power, authority and legitimation. The bibliography on this subject is enormous; and here is not

the place for a full and detailed analysis of the sociology of power. On the other hand, the implications of this research are particularly germane to the subject of this thesis. The semantic configurations of the terminology involved are both too controversial and too inextricably interwoven to allow the simplified definitions supplied by dictionaries to be more than a starting point. What follows, therefore, is an exploration of the meaning of these central concepts.[29]

1) The sociology of power and authority

At its extreme, the suspicious view of power regards its exercise as necessarily confrontational, and ends up by collapsing the concept "power" into mere "violence".[30] To be sociologically useful, the term "power" should be understood in a less hostile and at the same time far broader sense. There is no need, for example, to restrict its meaning to intended action. In practice, (as Freud among others has demonstrated) questions of intentionality, whether on the part of an instigator or a compliер, are far from clear-cut. This point has been overlooked, however, by most of those who deny the possibility of unintended power action. Following Bertrand Russell, Wrong argues against the concept of unintentional power: "Power relations would then become identical with the entire subject matter of sociology as the study of how human action (including beliefs and

emotions) is generated, shaped and constrained by the structures and networks of social relations in which we are all of us enmeshed from birth." Far from proving its intended point, however, this statement admirably summarizes the pervasive and vital nature of power.[31]

The ubiquity, and even to some extent the desirability of power in social interaction has long since been accepted by analysts with such contrasting views as Hobbes, Marx, Durkheim, Weber and Collingwood.[32] We can take this a stage further: social interaction is pervaded and animated by relationships of power in such a way that social order itself is structured through interlocking networks of power relations. In social interaction, the desire for order is central. By "order" in this context I do not mean either "moral order" or "social control", but rather a more or less predictable pattern involving the minimalization of both fear and conflict: "Men need an order within which they can locate themselves, an order providing coherence, continuity and justice."[33] The structuring and maintenance of social order is dependent upon the networks of power relations and the patterns of behaviour they set up. In all societies, therefore, power is perceived as being "the central order-related event".[34] Put simply, power lies at the very centre of social existence.

Though central, indeed due to its very centrality, the concept of power is far from easy to pin down; in Weber's

words, it is "sociologically amorphous".[35] Power operates in a variety of forms, which in any given situation are almost always found overlapping and reinforcing one another.[36] Coercion (the use or threat of force) is merely the most overt of such forms, and likewise the least efficient.[37] Persuasion (which appeals to rational conviction) is likewise inefficient. To be truly efficient, a prerequisite of effective rule, the deployment of power primarily rests neither upon coercion nor upon rational conviction, but upon belief. Where this crucial fiduciary element in the operation of power is predominant in a power relation, we may properly use the term "authority".[38]

Like other aspects of power, authority is necessarily relational, existing as a pattern of behaviour between individuals or groups, and also hierarchical, in that it operates between non-equals and in such a way as to reinforce the inequality.[39] It must be stressed, however, that although authority relations are necessarily asymetrical, they must also simultaneously reveal some degree of reciprocity. As with any kind of power relation, the pyramidal structure of the power networks inherent in authority relations operates constantly in both directions at once: even in cases of extreme imbalance, such relations are always two-way.[40]

As the structure of society depends upon the order and hierarchy inherent in power relations, the natural desire

for order ensures that people at all levels of society are predisposed to accept the necessity for authority and to attach the awe and belief that sustain authority to an individual or institution perceived as providing that order.[41] In this way, human beings engaged in social interaction intuitively seek to find a place within relations of authority for the sake of the order these relations provide: the will to be dominated is as much part of the power matrix as the will to dominate.[42] Social interaction is formulated in the first place according to normative power relations internalized from birth. "Submission to power is ... the earliest and most formative experience in human life."[43] Our earliest experiences of authority determines the model by means of which we are thenceforward able to recognize and respond to authority in a variety of other circumstances. The archetype of all authority is thus the parent/child relationship. This provides us with a model which we retain throughout our lives: on which we may gradually modify in the light of subsequent experience, but which is never wholly overturned.[44]

While various aspects of the idea of "liberty" have exercised strong appeal for some people at certain times, there is always a strong social desire among human beings to live within the structures of authority relations, what Freud termed the search for the "father", which is related to a desire to avoid the anxiety associated with choice and responsibility.[45] Neither moral rectitude nor

legality nor rational conviction are involved in the mechanism of authority at this level. The fiduciary nature of authority does not allow it to rely entirely, or even largely, on reasoned self-interest: in such cases the relationship ceases to be inherently authoritative. The mechanism of authority is ultimately to be understood as a more or less automatic response to commands emanating from a source in which the subject has ultimate confidence.[46] In practice, therefore, the operation of authority owes more to habit and imitation than to rationally based calculation. The constraints of habit are as real for those who command as for those who obey, for social order depends upon the recognition of an established way of doing things.[47]

Although it is permissible to say that someone "has authority" or is "in authority", this must be understood as a kind of shorthand. Strictly speaking, neither authority nor any other form of power can be possessed since, in a sociological context at least, these terms refer to relationships rather than commodities. Only the resources and symbols of power can be possessed.[48] The innate human propensity to anthropomorphize power encourages the perception of political, social and religious power-actions in terms of the individuals who are seen to guide them. Yet this conceptualization is more than a convenient shorthand: it conveys a very real attitude of mind which is none the less a distortion.[49] Power itself is neither an individual nor a resource:

"Resources are the media through which power is excercised and the structures of domination reproduced."[50] It is through the control of these resources that authority relations are formed and that the patterns which these relations continually reproduce are able to be translated into durable social structures. The operation of political authority is best seen not as a series of isolated instances of command and response, but as a durable pattern of such instances.[51]

ii) The relationship between authority and the symbolics of power

We have noted that the operation of authority is dependent upon belief, which is not given indiscriminately but is governed by the model of authority internalized primarily in infancy. The process of recognition involved in the fiduciary response to authority is based almost entirely upon symbolism. In practice all social interaction is dependent upon collective thought, which is itself not merely expressed by, but actually constituted in symbolic conduits such as language, mythology, ritual and art.[52] Our internal model of authority thus consists of symbols, and it is largely to these symbols that we respond when we judge something to be authoritative. The symbolism itself may thus be seen as a kind of resource through which authority operates; indeed, it is the most significant resource upon which authority relations

depend. Within relations of political authority, certain resources like wealth and armed force are liable to attrition as a result of deployment. Other resources which rely more on symbolism, such as prestige, are more complex, frequently being augmented rather than depleted in successful deployment.[53] The relationship between symbolism and authority is reciprocal: authority is dependent upon the use of symbols, while the successful exercise of authority reinforces the effectiveness of the symbolism. The symbolics of power, as we may term this kind of symbolism, are not mere "trappings", external to the mechanism of authority; they are an integral part of the operation of authority, inseparable from the "substance" of authority itself.[54]

The accumulation and manifestation of significant symbols is thus a vital aspect of the maintenance of authority relations; symbols can even be procured by the expenditure of other resources, such as physical effort and economic captial. The accumulated symbolic capital can then be translated into power-action; this translation and the enhancement of the value of the symbolism resulting from its successful outcome together form one of the most central mechanisms of authority.[55] Relations of political authority must therefore be understood to rely to a very real extent upon the perceptions of those subject to it. It is through the constant articulation and the constant perception of symbols that the repetitive pattern constituting the relationship between ruler and

ruled in the political sphere is transformed into the capacity to rule. Where this process is allowed to lapse, the network of relations through which authority is exercised risks becoming atrophied.[56] This constant and repetitive process is what I understand by the term "legitimation".

The relationship between authority networks and social structure ensures that we invest the symbolics of power with "meaning" which reaches beyond, and thus serves to justify, the hierarchy inherent in social interaction. We can avoid the anxiety of individual responsibility only if we justify this by placing our trust in successively higher levels in the hierarchy. This dynamic of self-justification, which is part of the parental archetype of authority, affects even the most powerful within the social power system. Social integration is only possible if those involved at every level justify its perpetuation by searching for meaning both within and beyond social structure.[57] In this way the authority relations in which we are inextricably enmeshed as members of a social group are symbolically linked to a higher level of meaning. Ultimately these higher levels of meaning are represented in terms of ideological belief: that is beliefs such as "the good of society", "the rule of law" and "the glory of God".[58]

Within the structure of this dynamic imperative, human beings in a social system are apt to perceive a strong

relationship between order on the social level and order on a cosmic level. Indeed the Greek term cosmos applies equally to the structure of social order, including government, and to the structure of the universe, in both the physical and metaphysical sense of the concept. Due to this relationship, political authority is often seen as transcendent and even, in Durkheim's phrase, as sacred. The perception of the intimate link between social and cosmic power is explored, often by means of conscious parallels, not only through effective government institutions and legal systems, but also through religion, science, philosophy and history.[59] On the political level, it is through the perception of the symbolics of power that the essential link between the ruler and the transcendent order-related centre is created and maintained. This link serves to demonstrate the relationship between authority and the higher levels of meaning, which in religious terms may be referred to as divine grace; that is to say it is, in the broadest sense of the term, charismatic.[60]

The symbolics of power do not, however, have a strict correlation with meaning; their interpretation is in reality a further extension of their symbolic value, itself requiring interpretation.[61] For this reason the context in which the symbolism appears not only adds information but actually provides an essential part of the interpretative process. While the "text" could remain the same in a given symbolic action, such as a ceremony, an

alteration in context might radically shift the accompanying cycle of interpretation and meaning. Symbolism is thus intimately bound up with a particular cultural context and is to this extent culturally specific. Though the need for a symbolic structure within which authority can be located is universal, the hermeneutic relativism of symbolic representation ensures that the precise form of this structure varies from one culture to another and even, to some extent, within cultures.[62] For this reason authority must always relate to the traditions of the society in which it operates; however, such a relationship can amount to inversion or even invention.[63] In view of the inevitability of both charismatic and traditional aspects of the symbolic representation of political authority, it is better to regard tradition and charisma as essential ingredients, rather than alternative forms, of the same phenomenon (even on a theoretical level, pace Weber).[64]

iii) The process of legitimation

It is now possible to relate this discussion to the central question of legitimation. The concept of "legitimacy" is too easily accorded an absolute value. It has often been equated with legality, which is unhelpful even though etymologically understandable. Since institutions, such as a legal system, derive their authority through association with the central symbolics

of power in the same way as individuals do, the concept of legality must be seen as dependent upon the operation of authority, not the other way round. "Legality" must therefore be understood as a mode of representing authority, rather than a quality of authority itself.[65] It is therefore better to use the concept in its verbal sense: as "legitimation" and "legitimating", rather than as "legitimacy" and "legitimate". As we have noted, the term "legitimation" is best understood in a pragmatic sense, as that ongoing process whereby the awe and belief necessary for authority to function are associated with individuals or institutions by means of symbolic representation.

It is not, however, that the symbolics of power in themselves confer authority in any absolute way. In cases of highly institutionalized political authority, certain specific symbols may become invested with such overriding importance that the operation of the authority is, for practical purposes, impossible without them. In such cases, the process of legitimation naturally reflects this, incorporating the necessary symbolism. These might be in the form of insignia (a crown, a sceptre), dress (ceremonial robes), procedures (elections), ceremonies (inaugurations, coronations), titles (president, party chairman), claims (divine right, heredity), and many others besides.[66] The concept of "legitimacy" in respect of a title is, in effect, a notion borrowed from the concept of inheritance. The claim to legitimacy of a

sovereign's title may indeed rest very largely on hereditary rights, but this will only be the case where heredity is generally recognized as the overriding determinant in the symbolic representation of authority within a particular socio-political context. In practice, however, even in predominantly institutionalized settings, only part of the process of legitimation derives from such "formal" symbols. The complexity of power networks ensures that, even where authority has a clearly defined public dimension, the relations that sustain it simultaneously operate through more amorphous channels (in Weber's term); and this other "private" dimension of authority is just as important. The less institutionalized the authority, the greater the scope for less "formal" aspects of legitimation.[67] The less concrete and formalized the modes of power-transference in a regime, the greater the symbolic importance of the founder within the overall representation of political authority.[68]

Reference to some legal codification may or may not play a significant role in the process of legitimation; but it must be emphasized that even where it does have such a role, it is as part of a much larger symbolic mode of representation. The most essential element in the legitimation of political authority, and perhaps the only one that is universally indispensable for the operation of authority, is the perception of success. The fiduciary nature of authority relations requires the operation of

authority to be seen as a more or less consistent pattern of success. Prolonged failure will clearly undermine the efficacy of authority; and although isolated instances of failure are not in themselves crippling, for authority to function properly failure must be masked or blame apportioned elsewhere. It is nevertheless the perception of success more than success itself which is the most vital element.[69]

The process of legitimation necessarily involves a great variety of symbolism, the make-up of which rarely remains entirely static over long periods of time. Although the symbolism reflects the needs of society as a whole, those with the greatest access to power in a given social structure have the greatest influence upon the prevalent representation of authority. For this reason, the representation of authority will naturally respond to changes brought about in the power relations within the socio-political structure. Such changes occur as a result of shifts in the distribution of power resources due to alterations in economic, demographic, social, political or military circumstances. However, because of the inherently traditional nature of symbolism, the changes in the symbolic construction will always lag behind changes in the socio-political structure, and may serve to obscure them. Indeed this is precisely their value in such circumstances, whether or not it is consciously so employed.[70]

Since the acceptance of authority is located in perceptions, it cannot be imposed, it can only be orchestrated, from above. Furthermore, this orchestration can operate effectively only where it is addressed to the deep-seated needs and desires and to the modes of perception that prevail in the social structure within which it operates. An illuminating parallel may be drawn with radio transmission, where clearly messages can only be successfully broadcast on a wavelength which the public are tuned in to. For this reason it is mistaken to talk in terms of the "creation" of such beliefs.[71] The process of orchestrating the beliefs necessary for the maintenance and reinforcement of authority may be carried on at many levels (including the unconscious) and with varying degrees of sophistication.[72] This does not require us to view ideology as simply a cynical and fraudulent manipulation of ideas and emotions: for the process of legitimation more usually involves an orchestration in which both the powerful and the power-subjects possess a genuine will to believe and participate.[73].

None of the above discussion of legitimation precludes the occurrence of an abrupt change of leadership, regardless of how this might be brought about. On the contrary, it helps to explain the comparative ease with which essentially the same channels of legitimation as were employed for an individual whose authority was established may be redirected towards a successor or a challenger. This process of transition is not always a

simple or smooth affair. The attempt to appropriate the symbolics of power may readily involve the use of force, or at least of some kind of overt display of coercion. In such circumstances we tend to speak of "usurpation".

iv) Usurpation

According to the OED, the term "usurpation" should be understood to mean the "unlawful or forcible seizure or occupation of a throne, sovereign power, etc." All too often, however, the term "usurper" is employed as a synonym of "illegitimate [in the sense of wrongful or unlawful] ruler". This conflation is problematic precisely to the extent that the term "illegitimate" is open to such varying interpretations; but it has come to be increasingly acceptable, since we live in a society where the use of force for political ends is generally regarded as suspect and easily equated with illegality. Indeed such a definition of usurpation, as we have already noted, begs the issues in the Roman empire of the third century, much as it does in Cromwell's Commonwealth or in modern Latin America. In order to tackle the phenomenon of usurpation in the Roman empire of the third century, it is best to restrict the use of the term to instances of "forcible seizure" of political power, that is the arrogation of the symbolics of power through the use of armed force, irrespective of contemporary or modern notions of the "legality" of such acts.[74]

v) Summary

Both power and authority, which is a special instance of power relying primarily upon trust, function within relationships which form part of the constructive matrix upon which social order depends. Authority depends upon the response, often subliminal or habitual, to a nexus of symbols recognized ~~as~~ within any cultural setting as "powerful"; in general this involves an element of both transcendence and tradition (even if the tradition is "invented"). To be effective, political authority relationships depend upon the constant articulation and reaffirmation of the link between an individual and the symbolics of power: legitimation is thus to be understood as an on-going process rather than as an initial assertion. In certain political contexts one may speak loosely of "legitimate accession" due to the symbolic weight placed upon certain criteria (such as legal or religious ratification, heredity and so forth); but even in such cases the confusion between "legitimacy" and "legality" is misleading~~ly~~, for legitimation continues to be a reiterative and ceaseless process. In other contexts, and the Roman empire is a case in point, such initial criteria are far outweighed by other aspects of the symbolism in response to which authority relations function. In view of the difficulties inherent in the interpretation of "legitimacy" as an absolute, the term cannot meaningfully be employed as part of the definition

of "usurpation"; instead we must restrict the latter to instances of the seizure of power involving a substantial measure or show of military force.

CHAPTER 7

USURPATION AND LEGITIMATION IN THE MID-THIRD CENTURY: THE LEGACY OF AUGUSTUS

7.a Assessing the Situation

We must begin this final chapter by taking stock of the situation as it now stands. I set out originally to take a fresh look at the political upheavals in the mid-third century and to shed some light on the development of imperial authority in this period. I wished to determine what validity there was in the almost universally accepted notion of a rupture in the constitutional development of the empire, a mid-third century "caesura", formerly expressed in terms of the abrupt transformation from "Principate" to "Dominate".

The first problem with which this endeavour was confronted was to determine what evidence was available to penetrate the gloom of the mid-third century, an historical "tunnel" for which lack of reliable sources is a conspicuous feature. The evidence supplied by the contemporary coins, inscriptions and papyri, though not without its difficulties, provided the means to analyse the broad outlines of the symbolic representation of imperial authority in some of the key reigns of the

period. The same information opened the way to the exploration of two further questions of key interest with regard to the political developments of this period. First, how helpful is the application of the conventional dichotomy between "legitimate emperors" and "usurpers" to the imperial contenders of this period? Secondly, can the anomalies which the career of Postumus, and to a lesser extent those of his successors, presented to this dichotomy be explained away by reference to "western separatism"? Our strongly negative answer to the second of these questions obliged us to reconsider the relationship between legitimacy and usurpation implied in the first.

In order to do this effectively, we had first to consider the reasons for the prevalence of the conventional dichotomy and the ideas that sustained it. This involved a review of the historiographical tradition which has encouraged a narrowly constitutionalist view of political power on the one hand and a view of the political (and cultural) developments of the Roman empire as a catalogue of decline on the other. Together with the paucity of evidence which is the historical "tunnel", these ideas helped to sustain the notion of a third-century caesura which became enshrined in the historiographical tradition and preserved by the inertia of that tradition in spite of efforts to question its validity. By returning to the basic concepts upon which any analysis of political authority must be founded and

conducting a fundamental review of their nature and interrelation, I have been able to demonstrate that the symbolics of power are integral to the operation of authority and that the legitimation of political power is always a process, operating through symbolic representaion, and that legal codification must be understood as a part of this wider on-going process.

We are now in a position to apply these findings to the particular situation of the Roman empire, to investigate the proper relationship of imperial authority to the symbolic representation found there. In this way it will be possible to tackle the problem of the political "caesura" of the mid-third century and to determine what the symbolic representation of imperial authority in that period can tell us about political continuity in the Roman empire.

7.b The Legitimation of Authority in the Roman Empire: The Legacy of Augustus

Applying the foregoing analysis to the situation in the mid-third century of the Roman empire we can appreciate the full significance of the symbolic representations which we have surveyed in the previous chapters and better understand the true relationship between them and the formal recognition by the senate. Far from being the acid

test of "legitimate authority" in the Roman empire, senatorial recognition is but one functional part of the process of legitimation (albeit one that was for some time of great importance). For our understanding of the political developments in the third century to benefit fully from these insights, we must first consider them in respect of the empire as a whole; indeed we must begin at the beginning with the situation that confronted the Roman world after the battle of Actium.

1) Legality and ambiguity in the foundation of the empire

During the civil wars that dominated the last century of the Roman republic, the senate as a corporate body had perforce relinquished much of its authority to a succession of its most powerful members. The last and most powerful of these was Julius Caesar's heir and the ultimate victor from a series of bloody civil wars culminating in the battle of Actium: the names by which the future emperor Augustus styled himself, Imperator Caesar divi filius, clearly reveal the symbolic basis of the young usurper's power.[1] Hope for the restoration of peace and stability was universally acknowledged to rest with this man. His newly established order could only be effective or lasting if accompanied by a return to a situation recognizable as political "normality"; and therefore, to consolidate his position, the young

imperator needed to present his power in a way which drew upon recognized traditions, rather than subverted them. At Rome this implied the reconciliation of his position of indisputable and overwhelming pre-eminence with the traditions of the senatorial rhetoric.[2]

What resulted was indisputably an absolute monarchy, but one that was represented ambiguously enough to avoid the more damaging associations that monarchy held at Rome. But we must remember that monarchy held more positive connotations elsewhere in the empire, especially in the Hellenistic east. That Actium had irrevocably changed the Roman world was recognized empire-wide, even at Rome itself. The universal acknowledgement of the power and the novelty of the victor's position was spontaneous, immediate and unequivocal.[3] In effect what the senate did was to acknowledge this fact.

Augustus was shrewd, and he was able to exploit the ambiguities inherent in political power to his great advantage; but he was not disingenuous in his dealings with the senate. The formal legalities which Augustus arrived at as a result of these dealings codified a complex collection of disparate powers which were later modified, reproduced and added to for successive emperors.[4] These legal clarifications were far from being empty charades. They were clearly of great importance to the empire's elite, which included not only Augustus himself but also those whose accounts represent our

literary sources; the views of such an important sector of society could not be ignored then and cannot lightly be dismissed now. Their value, however, just like that of the potent symbolism of res publica restituta which in some senses they embody, is to be seen not in any absolute notion of constitutional law but as part of a wider symbolic justification of imperial power. Dio, and many since him, have spoken of "the semblance of legality" with which Augustus cloaked his power; but surely this misses the central point. With regard to political authority, "legality" is a semblance, in the sense that it is a construction placed upon obedience to authority.[5]

The legal construction of Roman imperial authority was, as in all political systems, but one aspect of a broad symbolic process: a rather than the mechanism through which authority was legitimated. In the context of the Roman empire, however, to speak of "legitimacy", as opposed to a process of legitimation, is especially misleading. This was as much a difficulty for the ancient commentators as for historians today: the concepts princeps and legitimus were apparently never juxtaposed until, at the end of fourth century, they appear thus in Ammianus; even then the sense is negative and applied only to a fourth-century context. This suggests that the juxtaposition held little meaning until that date.[6] The reason for this is that, to a far greater degree than in most political systems, Augustus was able to maintain and legitimate his authority without sacrificing, indeed while

continually enhancing, the ambiguity which was precisely its main strength. In this way his authority vastly exceeded anything quantifiable in law. He himself maintained that while he excelled others in his auctoritas, his individual "powers" had been constitutionally entrusted to him by his fellow senators and the people of Rome, as to any ordinary magistrate. This classic understatement carefully refrains from revealing both the accumulation of such "powers" involved and by how much his authority exceeded the sum of their individual capacities.[7]

ii) The political legacy of Augustus

Augustus' position was essentially a paradoxical one which left a legacy of ambiguity for all the emperors who were to come after him. The emperor was primus inter pares (a paradox in itself); a citizen, a senator and a magistrate, and yet an absolute monarch whose word was law and who retained an almost complete monopoly over the access to military power; he was the empire's (and the senate's) lord and master, though he could also present himself as the servant of the state; he was a mortal, but was also the son of a god and himself divine.[8]

As a direct result of the fundamental ambiguity in the position of the emperor, rulership in the Roman empire was never properly institutionalized. Imperial authority remained peculiarly personal, so that the creation of a

governmental and administrative apparatus to meet the needs of imperial rule was both minimal and gradual.[9] The distinction between the emperor's "private" power and his "public", "governmental" or "official" power (which some have equated with "formally bestowed authority"), a distinction of dubious value in any theatre of power, is therefore particularly inadequate with regard to Roman imperial authority. This point more than justifies our rejection of the conventional distinctions between "official" and "unofficial" in this context.[10]

The most significant drawback of this deliberate lack of institutionalization, as Tacitus so acutely observed, lay in the matter of succession. In the Roman empire, even down to the Byzantine era, no overriding prescriptive mode of succession was ever formalized: there was in effect "no constitutional procedure for choosing an emperor".[11] Nor was the position of the Roman emperor clarified by the use of specific concrete regalia, such as a crown or a throne, the intrinsic value of which would permit their possession to be generally recognized as determinative in conferring authority. Moreover, there was no specific and decisive ceremonial inauguration, such as a coronation, that could be recognized as normative until at least the second half of fifth century.[12]

Even in the case of titulature the ambiguity precluded precision: no single designation, in Latin or Greek, answers to what we mean by the term "emperor" today. Our

modern terminology (emperor, empereur, Kaiser, prince, principe), derived from the ancient titles that formed part of the representation of imperial authority, is anachronistic in that it has become inevitably imbued with associations derived from the application of these terms to the more formalized institutions of medieval and modern monarchies. The title which most exactly indicates the position of the Roman emperor, then as now, is Augustus (Sebastos). Octavian, aware of the potential power of such symbolism, chose the title with care. It was perfectly suited to the ambiguities of Roman imperial authority: in origin indicating something more than human and semantically linked to auctoritas, the title had no prior history and thus was open to any interpretation, including immeasurable power.[13]

The ambiguity in the title "Augustus" allowed the emperor to be all things to all men; and to people of different outlooks, in different parts of the empire and at various times he was perceived very differently. What it most clearly came to signify, and certainly what it meant by the third century when it was the most pregnant and most indispensible of all the imperial titles, was "successor to the position of Augustus", or perhaps even more accurately "successor in the line of Augusti".[14] Imperial authority could only be represented as a kind of imitatio Augusti, and thus the fundamental ambiguity in the authority of Augustus was perpetuated, its representation serving as a paradigm. Roman imperial

authority, whether in the third century or the first, is thus intelligible only with reference to the symbolic representation of the authority of Augustus.[15]

The range of possible symbolic meanings in the representation of Augustus' authority defies discrete categorization. However, there are three accents within this range which stand out among the rest. Each of these can be associated with one of the other three titles which the founder of the empire favoured above the many he bore, and understandably, therefore, the same three from which our modern terminology derives: Princeps, Caesar and Imperator.

The title "Princeps" symbolized that aspect of the emperor's authority that was most "senatorial", without itself having any legal force. In his own Res Gestae Augustus repeatedly laid great stress on the idea that his extraordinary (and largely extra-legal) position was not incompatible with the ideology of the senate, of which he himself was the principal member (princeps senatus). He could thus justly say that he had refused all titles and honours that went beyond these bounds (even when such modes of representation were urged upon him by the senate and people).[16]

The title Caesar symbolized above all the hereditary aspects of imperial authority. The history of the empire shows that a very potent aspect of legitimation was the concept of heredity, especially among the army and in the

east where hereditary descent had long been an accepted principle of monarchical succession. It has been acutely observed that "No Emperor who had a son living was ever peacefully succeeded by anyone else." On the other hand the great majority of emperors left no living sons, and even in cases where a son survived, it was no guarantee of success in his bid to follow in his father's place.[17] In practice it would be better to speak of the representation of hereditary connections with a former emperor, rather than heredity as such, for there was no need for actual blood ties. As a form of symbolic heredity, adoption was regularly employed. Moreover, the representation of heredity, including adoption, could also be invented: Hadrian possibly and Septimius Severus quite certainly pursued this option. On a more fundamental level, the title Caesar implied the continuity of a symbolic lineage for the reigning emperor back to Augustus and indeed beyond back through the gens Iulii to Venus Genetrix.[18]

The most significant title in the representation of imperial authority, besides the title "Augustus" itself, was imperator: a title which symbolized the significance of the emperor's role as commander-in-chief of the Roman armies, the outstanding importance of the loyal support of the military and the central place of victory within the symbolism. Although it is sometimes suggested that Augustus played down the military aspect of his power, the fact remains that he made no secret of the fact that military power had enabled him to rise to his position of

pre-eminence in the first place. Furthermore, both for Augustus and his successors the emperor's role as supreme commander of the armies remained central to the symbolic representation of his authority (as also with Hellenistic royal symbolism). Augustus himself recognized the symbolic value of the title imperator, not only in his acceptance and promulgation of the multiple salutations he received on account of individual victories, but also in his assumption of the praenomen imperatoris. Indeed the distinction gained so much importance as an imperial symbol that it became strictly an imperial monopoly: when Tiberius allowed Blaesus to be hailed imperator by his troops in AD 22, this marked the very last occasion on which it was granted a commoner. Because of this monopoly, such acclamations came to amount to a claim or a challenge to imperial authority.[19]

iii) Legitimation and the Augustan paradigm

We may now consider in more detail the relationship between the legitimation by reference to the symbolic representation of the emperor as imperator and the emperor's legal ratification, which by the reign of Vespasian at the latest had taken the form of a single all-embracing decree of the senate. Not only was the acclamation by the troops (or initially by some significant army group such as the praetorian guards) often prior to the senatorial enactment in the

legitimation process, but it actually took precedence over the "legal" aspects within the representation. Throughout the history of the Roman empire, emperors tended to reckon their regnal anniversaries from the date of their <u>military</u> acclamations. Claudius I, Nero, Vespasian, Hadrian, Septimius, Didius Julianus, Macrinus and Elagabalus all assumed full imperial control, as well as full imperial titulature, on the acclamation of the troops, and dated their reigns from that event. What they demanded subsequently from the senate was merely confirmation of a <u>fait accompli</u>.[20] Here, as in so much else, the Roman emperors were merely following the precedent set by their paradigm. An emperor who had established himself at Rome through military might in civil war and with the support of his troops, as Augustus had done, could command the senate to recognize his authority and to outlaw any usurpers who rose against him. The word of the senate might appear authoritative in cases where the "outlaw" was defeated; but in other cases, such as those of Septimius Severus and Valerian, the very man the senators had so lately condemned was before long requiring and receiving their <u>retrospective</u> recognition:[21]

> Treason doth never prosper, what's the reason?
> For if it prosper none dare call it treason.

Attempting to accommodate these facts within the conventional scheme, Mommsen postulated that the soldiers had a constitutional right to elect the emperor. This idea has attracted much criticism, on the grounds that

from a purely constitutionalist point of view it borders on self-contradiction, and it has now generally been abandoned. Indeed not long ago one eminent scholar was able to refer to this idea as "Mommsen's aberration".[22] It seems to me, however, that both Mommsen and his critics suffer from an obsessive concentration upon supposedly "constitutional" rights to the point where the real workings of imperial authority within the power structure of the empire and the importance of symbolic aspects of legitimation, including military acclamation, become largely obscured.

The political legacy of Augustus was inherently unstable and therefore placed a particularly high premium on loyalty. Three examples will serve to show how the symbolic representation combined with imperial policies to provide a focus for the fostering of this loyalty. First there was the representation of the emperor as supreme benefactor, both in tangible ways, such as municipal and religious building programmes and the giving of games and in intangible ways, such as the "enjoyable gift of peace".[23] Secondly, there were imperial ceremonial pagents, such as those of <u>adventus</u>, <u>processus</u> and the triumph.[24] Thirdly, and most importantly, there was the focus of loyalty provided by the imperial cult.[25] The loyalty that counted most was that of those whose support was crucial to maintain order and stability - the administrative elite and the army (the make-up of both of which altered over time). Were this support to waver,

there was no purely constitutional justification of an emperor's claim over any rival that might arise. Protestations of loyalty in every form were therefore of paramount importance and received great emphasis.[26]

The primacy of the Augustan paradigm and the ambiguity it involved ensured that usurpation remained a constant feature of the empire. In a straightforward sense, an individual could make himself emperor simply through military victory and military acclamation. Throughout the duration of the Roman empire, by far the most common form of succession was usurpation, whether as a revolt against an established emperor or the seizing of the reins of power on the death of the former emperor. The history of the third century is only comprehensible if we understand that the empire itself began with usurpation, that usurpation was built into the paradigm and that whatever means of legitimation were available its shadow could not be expunged. It may even be helpful, therefore, to view Roman "emperors" as "successful usurpers" rather than to speak of "usurpers" as "falled" would-be emperors.

In this way the emperor's command of his soldiers' loyalty and his victoriousness, both of which were constantly reiterated, remained central elements in the legitimation of imperial authority. By themselves, however, these elements were not sufficient for legitimation, any more than the representations based upon legal standing or those based upon hereditly could be.

Through and beyond all three of these elements, the legitimation of imperial authority required the constant evocation of a symbolic pattern relating back to the Augustan paradigm.

Augustus had been careful not to present himself merely as a Hellenistic king or merely as a Roman magistrate. Instead he had amassed a range of disparate elements, some (but by no means all) of them codified in law; and beyond these he had drawn upon a wealth of resonant symbolic imagery (including some which related to Hellenistic kingship and others rooted in Roman military and cultural aspirations, Roman law, religion and myth) and had recombined them into something entirely new. Effectively what Augustus had achieved was to invent a tradition (one of great power and endurance) made up of disparate elements and combined in such a way that the only linch-pin holding them all together was Augustus himself. The imperial ideology of <u>imitatio Augusti</u> thereafter consisted in the constant evocation and constant reinterpretation of this tradition in the gradually changing circumstances in which imperial power operated over the centuries.

7.c The Changing Context of Imperial Authority and Usurpation

Since political authority cannot meaningfully be analysed solely in terms of legal structures or the actions of the ruler, but must also take into account the perceptions, expectations and beliefs of the ruled, we must forgo the search for clear-cut definitions of the "principate" and the "dominate" and consider instead the symbolic structures that sustained the regime and the belief system that underlay it. We should therefore reconsider the symbolic representation of imperial authority in the mid-third century in the light of what we have learned from the previous two sections. Before we can do so, however, we should note how the context in which imperial authority was exercised had altered considerably by the third century from that in which Augustus had established his supremacy.

i) Shifts in the strategic balance of the empire and the imperial response

The most crucial alteration was the decided shift in the strategic balance of the empire. From the perspective of Rome, the northern frontier from Hadrian's wall to the Black Sea had always been the most threatening; for this reason the best part of Rome's armies, both numerically and qualitatively, were stationed along this frontier.

The overthrow of the Parthian empire in the 220's by the bellicose and avowedly expansionist Sassanian Persians drastically and irreversibly altered the delicate strategic balance of the empire, requiring a greater proportion of Rome's military resources in the east. At roughly the same time, for reasons that are still imperfectly understood, the tribes beyond the Rhine and Danube began to come together into larger confederations which, though loosely bound, were often militarily effective (notably the Alamanni and the Franks); similarly the Goths and other East German tribes began to exert pressure on the Balkans. Whatever the exact details of what Luttwak has termed "defence in depth", there was clearly a shift from an essentially offensive strategy to one that was essentially defensive.[27]

From the late second century onward, as the external pressure grew perceptibly less containable, popular expectations grew for the emperor to take charge of the military situation personally. The emperor could not be everywhere at once; but wherever the emperor could not personally assume the role of general there was always the threat that the general delegated to deal with the threat could, if successful, be in a position to assume the role of emperor.[28] A partial solution was provided by the extension of the idea of shared rule. The idea in fact goes back to Augustus; and had already been extended by Vespasian (with Titus) and Marcus Aurelius (with first Lucius Verus, then Commodus). The joint reign of Marcus

and Luclus presented what amounted to an ad hoc geographical partition of competence between the two joint emperors, even though Marcus retained seniority empire-wide. From the early third century the tendency to elevate imperial kin to positions of co-rulership became common.[29] A significant example, again with an informal arrangement on geographical lines, is provided by the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus. It even became expedient to elevate sons too young to be of any active help in managing the empire, merely for the sake of keeping an imperial presence in certain strategic areas during the emperor's absence; an important example of this experiment was tried with limited success by Gallienus.[30] The significance and even the prevalence of co-regency and multiple emperors has often been overlooked. From the death of Antoninus in 161 until the deposition of Romulus Augustulus in 476 multiple emperorship of one form or another was the norm: there were indeed very few years in which a single emperor reigned unchallenged and unsupported by colleagues (including princes whose power was relatively nominal) throughout the empire.[31]

Our comprehension of this important fact, at least as it pertains to the third century, has been affected by the common tendency among historians to calculate the average length of reigns in this period without due regard for the fact that emperors reigned concurrently, both with and without mutual acknowledgement. The conventional dichotomy of senatorial legitimacy required that such

averages be calculated counting "legitimate emperors only". In failing to take into account the political fragmentation of the empire and in marginalizing the extremely significant phenomenon of co-regency, such calculations not only deprive the Tetrachy of a crucial element of its political context, but make nonsense of many of the reigns in the mid-third century, most especially the key reign of Gallienus.[32]

ii) Socio-political shifts: Rome, the senate and the emperor

From the late second century onwards, the emperor's protracted absences from Rome brought about the gradual diminution of the importance of the actual city of Rome within the administration of the empire. This diminution was both a symptom and an important cause of the decline of the senate as a central organ of government. Individual senators continued to be powerful within the entourage of the emperor wherever he might be, but the administrative and advisory roles of the senate could not continue when decisions of state were made at huge distances from the senate house.[33] In this way, the military circumstances of the empire began drastically to reduce senatorial access to power. The opportunities of personal advancement offered by the alternative channels of the imperial administration diminished the value of a senatorial career. The command strata of the army came to be drawn from a corps of professional soldiers who had

risen through the ranks so that, by the mid-third century, the divorce between senior military commands and senatorial careers had become altogether complete.[34] As the exigencies of the time tended increasingly to promote career army commanders to the position of emperor, it was not long before the emperors too ceased to be of senatorial extraction.[35]

At the same time, the emperor's presence on certain frontiers for lengthy campaigns often necessitated the elevation of their provincial headquarters into de facto regional "capitals"; that is strategic command centres with an operational mint. As the power-centre of the empire became itinerant, the city of Rome itself gradually ceased to fulfil the role of capital of the empire in anything but a metaphorical sense. By the end of the second century, "Rome" as the conceptual capital of the empire had already become divorced from Rome the physical city and was, in Herodian's phrase, wherever the emperor happened to be.[36]

One of the most significant features of the two major revisions we noted for the location of the mints in the mid-third century (above, 2.c/2.d) is the considerable increase in the status of the two cities of Antioch and Trier at this time. Whereas the "second eastern mint" used to be thought of as Valerian's principal mint in the Orient, it now looks as if Antioch was Valerian's eastern headquarters, and that it was here that Macrianus and Quietus held court. This is significant in view of

Antioch's role as an imperial "capital" in other periods, notably under Lucius Verus, Pescennius Niger, Macrinus and Julian. An even more significant revelation supplied by the revision concerns the status of Trier. Whereas it was previously assumed that Trier did not emerge as a regional imperial "capital" until the Tetrarchy, it is now possible to see that this status actually dates from the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus and, furthermore, that it was reconfirmed under the western emperors, being the seat of their power for almost a decade and a half.[37]

To some extent these factors facilitated usurpation by creating provincial power bases from which the revolts could be launched, and also made it easier for generals to assume the purple within a geographically limited area, the decline of Rome as the functional capital diminishing the necessity of the immediate "march on Rome". The increasing disruption which the political, military and economic difficulties of the third century promoted in turn intensified the difficulties of military communications and logistics that had always been a problem in the geographically extensive empire. This in turn increased both the autonomy of the generals on the frontiers and the frequency with which the various frontier armies chose to elevate their own generals to be emperor rather than accept the choice of another corps elsewhere in the empire.

Our observations on Postumus and the western emperors have shown that by the mid-third century it was possible,

not only for emperors to be proclaimed elsewhere than in Rome, but also for them to maintain their imperial authority without ever reaching the metropolis at all, or even securing the allegiance of the city and its senate. The Taciteаn imperii arcanum had been moved a stage further. It is not too much to suggest that this was as symptomatic of fundamental changes in the political structures of the Roman empire as the elevation of Galba had been. Furthermore it was to be just as profoundly significant for the future course of imperial history.

The apparent fragmentation of the empire in the third century as a result of such events should be taken as an expedient response to localized military and political pressures, not as expressions of latent "regional separatism". The forces of political fragmentation were counterbalanced by equal or stronger forces of cohesion: we should not lose sight of what might seem to be a truism, namely that the empire did not collapse at this point. This was partly due to a growing sense of unity (a "new Romanity" even) which had evolved in the empire, focused upon the person of the emperor; originally channelled through the imperial cult, it was later transmuted into the notion of the emperor as Christ's temporal vicar.[38] The spread of Roman citizenship and the rise of Christianity, for which the constitutio Antoniniana and the edict of Milan respectively were at least as much symptomatic as causal, played a central role in the forging of a "world community" (oikumeme),

permitting a vital shift in the meaning of the concept "Roman" which enabled "Rome" as a metaphor to outlast "Rome" as a political entity.[39]

The communities of the eastern half of the empire were on the whole both wealthier and better prepared to get the best out of a monarchical form of government. Throughout the first few centuries the centre of gravity of the empire moved gradually but decisively eastwards, and the changing ethnic make-up of the senate was symptomatic of this eastward shift.[40] Even before the third century, the old Roman senatorial values, with their problematic attitude towards kingship and their insistence upon the absolute value of senatorial recognition, had begun to lose much of its significance. For the members of a changing senatorial elite in a changing world, however, traditions were most precious, and thus senatorial recognition continued to be as paramount in the senatorial perspective.[41]

In the changed circumstances of the third century, however, the old senatorial ideals were of comparatively little consequence to those who now wielded power. The increased pressures on the frontiers and the frequency of civil war and mutiny within the empire did not allow much leisure for cultivating the political support of a group whose influence was as obsolescent as their ideals. Just as the sovereignty of the people lived on as an important legal concept within the legitimating symbolism, even though the practice of popular voting had long since been

subsumed within the compass of the senate, so the symbolic significance of senatorial legal enactments altered in response to the changing context of senatorial power.[42]

7.d The Symbolic Legacy of Augustus: Aspects of Continuity in the Third Century AD

Supported by the senatorial tradition, the conventional view of the history of imperial authority, with its caesura drawn through the third century, distingulshes starkly between the earlier _princeps_ and the later _dominus_. This seems to me erroneous: the plain, if seemingly paradoxical, truth is that the emperor was always both simultaneously. It is true that Augustus rejected the title _dominus_ and encouraged the use of the acceptably republican terms _princeps_ and _principatus_ to refer to his position, just as he had employed _recusatio_ across a wide range of symbols which too overtly suggested kingship or divinity at Rome.[43] As with the "constitutional settlements" of the third decade BC, however, political astuteness rather than modesty provided the motive, and the enhancement rather than diminution of his authority was the result.[44] Thus, while Augustus had avoided the title _dominus_ and, at least at Rome, had played down his representation as divine, his power was nevertheless perceived in a way that had fully embraced those ideas and they both formed part of the paradigm of

Imperial authority. Domitian was denounced in our senatorial sources because he had overstepped the bounds of "civility" by insisting on the title dominus et deus noster, not because such a title was inappropriate: indeed Trajan, whom Pliny was at pains to contrast with Domitian, was readily accepted as dominus, even by Pliny himself. The emperor had thus been accepted as "lord" and worshipped as divine over most of the empire for at least a century and a half before the style deus et dominus was introduced to the coinage of Aurelian.[45]

In fact all the main accents of the symbolic representation of imperial authority which we have noted in the mid-third century relate back to Augustus. That is not to say that every symbol used in the legitimation of imperial authority in the third century exactly and exclusively reproduced the symbols used for Augustus. We are here concerned with a tradition, and the way in which traditions are used may gradually change over time with constant use (just as copies of a copy gradually become ever greater distortions of the original). This is especially important with regard to symbolism because of the relationship between symbols and their context. As the context in which imperial authority operated gradually changed, so the symbols themselves were altered to meet the needs of the new situation, though this was not necessarily a conscious move. The imagery we looked at from the third century tells us that imperial authority was perceived and legitimated in terms of the contemporary

understanding of the Augustan paradigm.[46] We today, with the benefit of careful historical research, perceive Augustan ideology in a particular light, but it would be wrong to suppose that emperors and their subjects in the third century saw the matter in the same light.

The representation of imperial authority in the third century was actually much more true to its model than the standard orthodoxy allows. For example, legitimation through the representation of victory was as essential to Augustus as to Valerian, Aurelian or Postumus. The changes that some have pointed out in the "theology of victory" over the intervening centuries have been exaggerated. In particular I find the argument that "victory" became more of an ideal very dubious. The argument requires both the underestimation of the extent of idealism in the Augustan model and the underestimation of the significance of genuine victories in the third century.[47] The alignment of imperial <u>virtus</u> with Mars in the third century is but an extension of one of the central symbolic themes of Augustan ideology, portrayed in the temple of Mars Ultor.[48] Even the solar theology of victory that we found to some extent under the Licinii and carried to great lengths under Aurelian is firmly rooted in the tradition of the Augustan paradigm. Both the temple of Actian Apollo on the Palatine and the solarium in the Campus Martius associated the victories that confirmed Octavian's supremacy over the Roman world with solar deities, presenting these deities in effect as

comites Augusti. Furthermore, the solar representation of imperial authority, itself related to Hellenistic royal solar symbolism, was a ubiquitous feature of imperial ideology and representation from the beginning of the empire down to Byzantine times.[49]

Augustus placed the utmost emphasis on the representation of himself as Saviour of the Roman world, the Bringer of Peace and the Father of his Country; these elements of Roman imperial symbolism were added to and enhanced through the centuries, as we have seen.[50] Similarly, the symbolic theme of the emperor as the restorer of the "Golden Age", the re-founder of Rome, the embodiment of the destiny of eternal Rome and the descendant of Venus Genetrix already existed under Augustus; these themes were encapsulated in his forum with its temple of Mars Ultor, the centrepiece of Augustan ideology. It was here that Augustus, in spite of his rejection of the title, was symbolically represented as the "new Romulus".[51] Indeed Augustus was justly proud of his role as the refounder of Rome, not only in the metaphorical, but in the literal sense. Although he did not go so far as to rename the city after himself, his self-representation as the new founder of Rome set a precedent which Commodus carried a stage further in renaming the city Colonia Commodiana.[52]

The notion of restitutor orbis, so central to the third-century symbolism, was likewise inspired by the

central Augustan symbolism of res publica restituta; indeed the iconography of the coin types minted for Valerian and Gallienus bearing the title restitutor orbis was ultimately derived from an Augustan prototype.[53] By the third century, the shift in the significance of "Rome", which had allowed the emperor to be represented not just as restitutor urbis but as restitutor orbis, meant that the resonant symbolism of the emperor as restorer and refounder and as the fulfilment of the destiny of eternal Rome was no longer specifically related to the city on the seven hills: Postumus could be symbolically associated with Roma Aeterna several hundred kilometers to the north in Gaul; equally Constantine could site his "New Rome" several hundred kilometers to the east at Byzantium, and indeed could name the new city after himself in the Hellenistic tradition. Both were true to the Augustan paradigm, as it appeared at the time; both were concerned primarily, in terms of the symbolic aspects of their actions, with continuity reaching back to the past not with radical change.[54]

One of the most significant shifts within the imperial symbolism, resulting from the eastward shift in the focus of the empire and the rise of Hellenism in the empire (of which the foundation of Constantinople was symptomatic), was the representation of imperial authority by increasingly explicit use of Hellenistic royal symbols. Augustus had been in a sufficiently secure position not to need the overt use of such symbols, and since it suited

his need to relate his authority back to the traditions of the republic, and since their rejection enhanced his authority at Rome, he made a point of expressing the wish to do without them. His third-century successors were not in such a position, and their pressing need was to relate to those aspects of the authority of Augustus which were perceived to be most important in the third century and to the traditions of the succession of Augusti. Postumus' use of the "republican" symbolics (the consulate, the annual tribunician powers and so on), without reference to their original urban and senatorial contexts, demonstrates how much such symbols had shifted from symbolic association with the traditions of the republic to symbolic associations with the traditions of imperial authority itself (above, Ch.5.c).

The essential point to bear in mind is that the innovations and changes of emphasis that we have observed in the imperial symbolism of the third century do not in any way suggest a radical break with the past: in fact they suggest quite the reverse. As we have seen, Augustus had his own very good reasons for wishing to avoid being represented too overtly as a (Hellenistic) monarch and a god, but this in itself did not alter the fact that the vast majority of his subjects naturally perceived and responded to his authority according to their internalized symbolic relationship with power on that scale. The prevailing responses to political power in the Roman empire thus conditioned the symbolic representation of

imperial authority precisely in terms of monarchical and divine power, even under Augustus.[55] His rejection of some aspects of this representation in his lifetime did not affect their implicit presence in the symbolism with which his authority was surrounded, and their application to his posthumous authority is therefore very revealing. It was, after all, Augustus' posthumous image which remained after his death to perpetuate his paradigm. By the third century, as indeed right from the start in the Hellenistic east, the prevailing attitudes to imperial authority, which found expression in the symbolic representations that were manifested in the material evidence, perceived Roman imperial authority in much the same manner as it had perceived Hellenistic royal authority before. It is revealing that the Christology that emerged in the (Hellenized) Roman empire took very much the same symbolic form, borrowing even the same titles, insignia and other symbolic associations.[56]

Those commentators, ancient and modern alike, who have taken the essentially Romanocentric and senatorial line of placing the utmost emphasis upon the "constitutional" aspects of Augustus' legitimation, or on the characteristics of civilitas and recusatio, have obscured the fact that these were but a fraction of the process of legitimation available to Roman emperors from Augustus onwards, and one which had its greatest appeal to but a small, if for some time influential, class at Rome. Recent studies on the power of the Augustan monarchy have

started to understand and come to terms with the wider symbolics of his power: both the symbolism that Augustus himself manipulated and that which others applied to him.[57] What we have seen in this present study is the application of this wider Augustan symbolism to the history of the third century AD. Understood in this light we can properly appreciate that the mid-third century does not represent a catastrophic break with the traditions of the past, a caesura in the history of Roman imperial history. There were indeed significant changes that were taking effect at that time: but these changes were located in the social and cultural structure and, above all, in the strategic balance of the empire, that is in the context in which imperial authority was operating. What we have seen in the symbolic construction of imperial authority was primarily a strong emphasis upon continuity. The innovations and alterations which the evidence has brought to light are best explained, not as a radical departure from Augustan ideology, but as part of an on-going repetition and reinterpretation of the Augustan model: in short, as part of a gradual shift of emphasis <u>within</u> the Augustan paradigm.

CONCLUSIONS

In order to be able to study what developments may have been taking place in imperial authority in the mid-third century, a period that has been characterized as a tunnel, we turned to the contemporary evidence supplied by the coinage, inscriptions and papyri. We analysed this material to determine what verbal and iconographic imagery was employed as part of the legitimation of imperial authority. Certain themes emerged from our survey of this material which were both illuminating and at the same time cast doubt on many aspects of the conventional approach to imperial authority in this period.

Among the principal themes of the symbolism we reviewed was a great emphasis laid upon the military capacity of the emperor, both as the commander-in-chief of the armies, the allegiance of which was strongly emphasized, and as the glorious and victorious defender of the empire whose virtus was divinely inspired and whose divinely ordained victories were often enumerated and extolled. As the provider of peace, security and prosperity, the emperor was chosen favourite of the gods: he is represented as the the incarnation of Rome's eternal and divinely ordained destiny, chosen by the gods to be the restorer of the

Roman world and the guarantor of a veritable "golden age". Besides these themes, which were concerned above all with the relationship of the emperor with the armies, with success and with the gods, there were three other aspects of particular note, all of which can be perceived in the brief summary above: the repetitive nature of the symbolism; its tendency towards hyperbole and exaggeration; and most important of all, the enormous emphasis laid on continuity. Despite the inclusion of several elements that did not seem to fit into the traditional image of Augustus, there was also visible in this symbolism a very strong element of imitatio Augusti.

In the light of the evidence we surveyed it was clear that the western emperors, starting with Postumus, had adopted the very same language of legitimation and that consequently there was no support here for the notion of "Gallic separatism". On reconsidering the evidence from other sources on the question, we were able to conclude definitely that the western emperors had to be treated alongside the other usurpers of the period rather than as a case apart. This in turn required that we rethink the conventional dichotomy of Roman imperial legitimacy in the third century, based on senatorial recognition, for this could not account adequately for the apparent success of Postumus. On questioning the historiographical tradition in which the conventional dichotomy was rooted we found it to have placed too great a reliance upon the literary evidence, with its senatorial and Romanocentric viewpoint.

The ancient senatorial notions of "liberty" and "decline" which run through the historiographical tradition have played into the inherent difficulties of the historical "tunnel" in the third century to produce an exaggeratedly stark form of periodization in our conceptualization of the Roman empire. Furthermore the senatorial ideals, of which "liberty" was the most important, have affected our understanding of political authority and its relation to power and legitimation.

Having undertaken to review the central concepts in the study of political authority it became clear that authority could not be defined as "legitimate power"; authority is a special type of power relation based on trust, the legitimation of which is an on-going process rather than an absolute right. This process of legitimation, which is vital for authority to be effective, depends upon the articulation and perception of the symbolics of power. It is thus possible to see that the symbolic representations of imperial authority with which we were earlier concerned, far from being "mere trappings", were central to the mechanism of imperial authority itself.

Applying these findings to the Roman empire we were able to perceive the crucial importance of the deliberate ambiguity around which Augustus had constructed his authority. The only connection between the disparate parts of the traditions which Augustus adapted and

invented to help legitimate his authority was the personal authority of Augustus himself. Thus we were able to understand the centrality of imitatio Augusti in the symbolic legacy of Augustus. The nebulous relationship of the principate to the legal structures of the state placed a particularly high premium on the symbolic representation of success, and especially on the association between the emperor and military victory. Part of the Augustan paradigm remained the fact that Augustus had initially come by his power as a direct result of victory in civil war and had placed the symbolic representation of the divinely ordained victor at the very centre of his legitimation.

The characteristics of imperial authority which were most important to the senatorial writers whose record has formed the basis of our understanding only account for one aspect of the legitimation of imperial authority. Although the legal ratification of the emperor's power formed a significant part of the representation of imperial authority, senatorial recognition must be understood as an incremental layer within a much larger process of legitimation: to confirm more than to confer imperial power. It showed neither more nor less than that the emperor in question had gained the allegiance of the senators at Rome, and must take its place alongside other manifestations of loyalty and support. At no time did these legalities do more than act as a symbol to which people attached more or less importance, depending on

their background and beliefs. The changing circumstances in which imperial authority had to operate gradually shifted the emphasis within the symbolic legacy of Augustus away from the senatorial aspects of legitimation towards a more openly Hellenistic style. We found, however, that the emphasis remained on continuity with the Augustan tradition.

In the final analysis the evidence suggests that the conventional caesura in the mid-third century is more misleading than helpful in terms of understanding the development of imperial authority in that period. We have found, in effect, that the history of the third century has become a hostage to its own reputation, which has served to obscure the extent of continuity that runs through the period. Adaptations were indeed necessary to cope with an empire which was undergoing many significant changes in other respects, not least in its strategic alignment. But we have found that the idea of a drastic change in the nature and legitimation of imperial authority in the mid-third century simply cannot be sustained. The baleful legacy of the Principate/Dominate conceptualization of the empire, redolent with value judgements borrowed from a tendentious literary tradition, can now more easily be laid to rest.

ABBREVIATIONS

EMPERORS AND THEIR FAMILIES:

A = Aurelian
G = Gallienus
L = Laelian
M = Marius
Ma = Mariniana
P = Postumus
Sa = Salonina
Ss = Saloninus
Sv = Severina
T = Tetricus
T2 = Tetricus II
V = Valerian
V2 = Valerian II
Vi = Victorinus

PERIOD (Licinian house only):

Jr = joint reign (AD 253-260)
Jr+ = Jr(-style) coinage produced after the capture of V
sr = sole reign (AD 260-68)

MINTS:

Ant = Antioch (principal eastern mint)
Byz = Byzantium ("Uncertain" mint, A)
Col = Cologne (subsidiary Gallic mint, incl. "Mainz?")
Cyz = Cyzicus (incl. "SPQR" coinage, under G)
Med = Milan
Lug = Lyon
Rom = Rome
Sam = Samosata (subsidiary eastern mint [jr, V/G])
Ser = Serdica
Sis = Siscia
Tic = Ticinum
Tre = Trier (principal Gallic mint)
Trp = Tripolis
Vim = Viminacium

DENOMINATIONS:

AV = aureus
AAV = binio (double) aureus
QAV = quinarius (half) aureus
Quat = quaternio (quadruple) aureus
An = antoninianus (incl. the post-reform "radiates")
Den = denarius (incl. post-reform "denarii")
AE = bronze (sesterces, as, etc.)
AVm = gold medallion
ARm = silver medallion
AEm = bronze medallion
Absch = Abschlag (base metal coin; dies intended for AV)

REFERENCES/CATALOGUES:

In addition to the standard abbreviations, such as CIL, ILS, AE, BMC (always to be understood as referring to the Roman Empire volumes), etc., the following abbreviations were employed in the notes of this work:

B.	= cat. in Bastien (1967)
Baval	= cat. in J. Gricourt, "Le trésor de Baval", in XIIe Suppl. à Gallia (1958), 3-119
Blackmoor	= cat. in Bland (1982)
Carson	= cat. in Carson (1980)
Cohen	= cat. in Cohen (1885-8)
Cunetio	= cat. in Besly & Bland (1983), 73-167
de Witte	(see below: s.v. Witte)
Doyen	= cat. in Doyen (1984)
E.	= cat. in Elmer (1941)
Espérandieu	= E. Espérandieu, Inscriptions latines de la Gaule (Narbonnaise), vol. 2, Paris, 1929
Fitz/Sis.	= cat. in Fitz (1981-2), 29-43
Gnecchi	= cat. in Gnecchi (1912)
Hunter	= cat. in Robertson (1978)
K.	= app. in König (1981), 191-224
Lyon	= cat. in Bastien (1976)
Maravelle	= cat. in Estiot (1983), 71-115
Milan	= cat. in Estiot (1991), 469-80
Milne	= cat. in Milne (1933)
Normanby	= cat. in Bland & Burnett (1988), 114-215
Peachin	= cat. in Peachin (1990), 106-493
RIC	= cat. in Webb (1927), (1933) (*)
Rohde	= cat. in Rohde (1881)
S.	= cat. in Schulte (1983)
Sirmium	= cat. in Kellner (1978), 19-53
Siscia	= cat. in Alföldi (1931), 25-35
Sotgiu	= app. in Sotgiu (1961), 81-93
St Mard	= cat. in Lallemand & Thirion (1970)
Stevenage	= cat. in Bland (1988a)
Syria A	= cat. in Brenot & Pflaum (1965): "trésor A"
Syria B	= cat. in Brenot & Pflaum (1965): "trésor B"
Syria C	= cat. in Bastien & Huvelin (1969)
Syria D	= cat. in Pflaum (1980)
Travaux	= cat. in Bastien (1958)
de Witte	= cat. in de Witte (1868)

(*) NOTE: RIC followed by a Roman numeral refers in the standard way to the volumes of H. Mattingly & E.A. Sydenham, et al., Roman Imperial Coinage, London, 1923ff.

TABLE A:1

Coin types for Severina and Aurelian, possibly minted after the emperor's death

Coin types and refs.	Mint-mark of poss. posthumous issues	Other refs.
1. CONCORDIAE MILITVM (Concordia with 2 standards)		
[Rom, An, Sv] RIC 4	R/A//XXI to R/S//XXI	Estiot (1983), 36
[Tic, An, Sv] RIC 8	--//PXXT to --//VIXXT	Estiot (1983), 21
[Cyz, An, Sv] RIC 18	--//XXI	Estiot (1983), 32
[Ant, An, Sv] RIC 20	P//XXI to VI//XXI, Z//XXI, H//XXI	Weder/King (1984), 206
[Sis, An, Sv] RIC 13	P//XXI to VI//XXI	(*1)
2. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM (Sol and Concordia/Fides) (*2)		
[Tic, An, Sv] RIC 10	--//VXXT to --//VIXXT	Estiot (1983), 20
[Tic, An, A] RIC 153	--//PXXT	(unconfirmed)
3. PROVIDEN DEOR (Sol and Concordia/Fides) (*2)		
[Tic, An, Sv] RIC 9	--//VXXT to --//VIXXT	Maravelle 380-5
[Tic, An, A] RIC 152	--//PXXT to --//QXXT	Maravelle 372-9; Sirmium 437
[Sis, AV, A] RIC 189		(Rohde 33)
[Sis, An, A] RIC 256	S//XXIP to S//XXIVI	Sirmium 1205-7
[Ser, An, A] RIC 284	--//KAΓ , --//KAΔ (May also have *//KAΓ, etc.)	Maravelle 577; Sirmium 1536
[Ser, An, A] RIC 285	--//KAΔ (or *//KAΔ)	

(*1) However, Estiot (1983), 23, 25, does not see any reason to suppose that any of the Siscian coinage was produced after Aurelian's death.

(*2) Iconography: Sol, radiate with cloak, holding globe, r.h. raised; opposite Concordia/Fides(?) holding 2 standards.

TABLE A:2

Coins of Aurelian bearing the title RESTITVTOR ORIENTIS

-------In preparation for the first Palmyrene campaign-------

1. (Female figure ["Oriens"] offers emperor a wreath)

1a. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Med, An] RIC 140 (Maravelle 118-9; Sirmium 157-61).
1b. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Sis, An] RIC 234 (Maravelle 405-6; Sirmium 479-86, 488-91).

2. (Emperor raising kneeling female figure ["Oriens"])

2a. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Cyz, An] RIC 351 (Sirmium 1566-8).

----------From the summer of 272 onwards----------

1. (Female figure ["Oriens"] offers emperor a wreath)

1c. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Med, An] RIC 140 (Maravelle 152-7, 181-9; Sirmium 192-7).
1d. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Sis, An] RIC 234 (Sirmium 487).
1e. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Sis, AV] Manns (1939), 28 (RIC -).
1f. RESTITVTORI ORIENTIS [Byz, An] RIC 404.

2. (Emperor raising kneeling female figure ["Oriens"])

2b. RESTITVT ORIENT [Rom, An] Manns (1939), 43 (cf. RIC 350; Estiot (1983), 34
2c. RESTITVTOR ORIENTIS [Sis, An] RIC 233 (Sirmium 937-40).
2d. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Cyz, An] RIC 351 (Maravelle 642; Sirmium 1591-9).

3. (Emperor riding down 2 enemies with his spear)

3a. RESTITVT ORIENTIS [Cyz, AV] Manns (1939), 43 (RIC -).

NOTE: See also table A:16, no. 2b.

TABLE A:3
Coins of Aurelian bearing the title
RESTITVTOR ORBIS

1. (Female figure hands wreath to emp., with spear or long sceptre)

1a. RESTITVT ORBIS [Rom, An] RIC 53 (Maravelle 20; Sirmium 19).
1b. RESTITVT ORBIS [Med, An] RIC 139 (Maravelle 229-34, 260; Sirmium 288-94).
1c. RESTITVT(OR) ORBIS [Sis, An] cf. RIC 234 (Maravelle 491; Sirmium 941-5).
1d. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 287.
1e. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 288 (Maravelle 581; Sirmium 1505).
1f. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 289 (Maravelle 576, 582-3; Sirmium 1506-15; cf. 1516).
1g. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 290 (Maravelle 575, 578; Sirmium 1517-23).
1h. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 291 (Sirmium 1524).
1i. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 292 (Sirmium 1525).
1j. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 293-4.
1k. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 295 (Sirmium 1526-8).
1l. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 296.
1m. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 297 (Maravelle 579; Sirmium 1529-33).
1n. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 298 (Maravelle 580; Sirmium 1534).
1o. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 299 (Sirmium 1535).
1p. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 300-04 [INVICTVS obv.].
1q. RESTITVT ORBIS [Ser, An] RIC 305-6 [DEO ET DOMINO obv.].
1r. RESTITVT(.) ORBIS [Byz, An] RIC 399 (Maravelle 588-91, 603-15; Sirmium 1213-39, 1309-33)
1s. RESTITVTORI ORBIS [Byz, An] RIC 403 (Estiot (1983), 29).
1t. RESTITVT(.) ORBIS [Cyz, An] RIC 347-8 (Maravelle 644; Sirmium 1601-3).
1u. RESTITVT(OR) ORBIS [Cyz, An] RIC 347 (Maravelle 646; Sirmium 1615-31).
1v. RESTITVTOR ORBIS [Cyz, An] cf. RIC 368 (Maravelle 657-9, 661-2; Sirmium 1660-1701).
1w. RESTITVTOR ORBIS [Cyz, An] RIC 347-8 (Maravelle 652-4; Sirmium 1771-96).
1x. RESTITVT.ORBIS [Ant, An] cf. RIC 386 (Maravelle 677; Sirmium 1817-19; Syria C 80-90).
1y. RESTITVT ORBIS [Trp, An] RIC 389 (Maravelle 678; Syria B 34-7; Syria C 344-53; 362-3; 365-8).

2. (As above, but between them a small kneeling figure: a suppliant)

2a. RESTITVTOR ORBIS [Cyz, An] cf. RIC 349 (Maravelle 647-51; Sirmium 1632-52).

3. (As 1, but it is Victoria with palm that hands wreath to emperor)

3a. RESTITVTOR ORBIS [Cyz, An] RIC 369 (Maravelle 672, 676; Sirmium 1802-8).

NOTE: See also table A:16, nos. 7b, 9c.
NOTE TO ICONOGRAPHY: 1/2: Orbis terrarum not Victoria (as in RIC).

TABLE A:4

Perpetuus Imperator and associated titles for Aurelian

1. Perpetuo Imp(eratori)

1a. [Africa Procos.]: CIL VIII 10076 (22058);
CIL VIII 22011 (Sotgiu 18);
CIL VIII 22067 (Sotgiu 19);
CIL VIII 22120; 22132;
CIL VIII 22178;
Sotgiu 20;
Sotgiu 22;
Sotgiu 23;
Sotgiu 25.

1b. [Numidia]: CIL VIII 10133;
CIL VIII 10154 (22244);
CIL VIII 22209;
CIL VIII 22241 (Sotgiu 32).

1c. [Germania Sup.]: CIL XIII 9139 (C.I.Rh. 1939).

2. Soli Invicto Sacr(um)
pro salute et incolumitate Perpetui Imp(eratoris)

2a. [Numidia]: CIL VIII 5143 (ILS 580).

3. Perpetuo Victoriosissimo Indulgentissimo Imp(eratori)

3a. [Mauretania Sitif.]: CIL VIII 20537 (Sotgiu, 48).

3b. [Numidia]: CIL VIII 10205 (restored);
CIL VIII 10217 (ILS 578);
AE 1981, 917;
Sotgiu 38;
Sotgiu 41;
Sotgiu 43;
CIL VIII 10177 (as "Victorissimo");
Sotgiu, 37 (as "Victrisissimo").

4. Perpetuo Gloriosissimo Indulgentissimo Imp(eratori)

4a. [Numidia]: CIL VIII 22361 (Sotgiu 34: as "Glorisimo Indulgentisimo");
CIL VIII 22449 (Sotgiu 36).

5. [Perpet]uo Impera[to]r[i] Invicto Imperatori Fortissimo Imperatori

5a. [Africa Procos.]: Sotgiu, 26.

TABLE A:5
The distribution of CONCORDIA MILITVM
and related types for Aurelian

CONCORDIA MILITVM (Emperor and Concordia clasping hands):
[Med, An] RIC 120 (Mara. 122; 160-65, 198-200; 239-47;
Sirm. 165; 191-201; 295-310).
[Sis, An] RIC 216 (Mara. 454-5, 460, 466; Sirm. 761-7).
RIC 217-9 (cf, Mara. 480; Sirm. 934-6).
RIC 244 (Mara. 492-503, 505-9; 510-13, 515-7, 519; 522-6;
528-33, 535-8, 540-2, 545, 547-9; 552-3; 555-6;
Sirm. 946-1065; 1195-12104; 1096-1106, 1108-57;
1184-5; 1107).
RIC 59 (Sirm. 1066-70).
[Ser, An] RIC 273.
[Cyz, An] RIC 356.
[Byz, An] RIC 392 (cf. Sirm 1308).
(CONCORD.MILIT):
[Byz, An] RIC 391 (Mara. 624-30; Sirm. 1363-79; cf. 1361-2).

CONCORDIA MILI (Concordia seated with 2 standards):
[Med, AV] Milan 7-8 (cf. RIC 87; 88, unconfimed).
Milan 13, 15-19 (Manns (1939), 17; cf. RIC 166).
[Sis, An] RIC 194-5 (cf. RIC 196-7, unconfirmed).

CONCORDIA MILI (Concordia with 2 standards):
[Sis, An] RIC 192 (Mara. 389-90; cf. Sirm. 450).
RIC 193.

CONCORDIA MILI (Concordia with 4 standards):
[Sis, An] RIC - (Sirm. 451).

CONCORDIA MILI (2 Concordiae with 3 standards):
[Med, AV] Milan 4, 14, 20-22 (Manns (1939), 17; cf. RIC 167).
[Sis, An] RIC 199 (Mara. 191, 193; Sirm. 442-7;
cf. Mara. 394; Sirm. 441).
RIC 200.
RIC 201 (Sirm. 448).
RIC 202 (Mara. 392; Sirm. 449).

CONCORD LEGI (Concordia with 2 standards):
[Med, AV] Milan 23 (Manns (1939), 25; cf. RIC 168; cf. 86, 169?).
[Med, An] RIC 102 (Mara. 113-16, 120; Sirm. 152;
Blackmoor 3686; Normanby 1259).

CONCORD LEGI (Concordia with 4 standards):
[Med, AV] Milan 30 (Manns (1939), 24; cf. RIC 10).
[Med, An] RIC 103 (Estiot (1991), 453; pl. XCL, g).

CONCO EXER (Concordia seated with 2 standards):
[Med, An] RIC 101 (Normanby 1261).

NOTE TO REFERENCES: Mara. = Maravelle; Sirm. = Sirmium.

TABLE A:6

Imperial Virtus I:
The correlation between VIRTVS MILITVM/EQVIT types
and parallel VIRTVS AVG types

1. (Emp. cuirassed with spear/sceptre; Mars hands him small victory)

1a. VIRTVS MILITVM	[Med, An, A] RIC 147 (*1) (Blackmoor 3707-21; Mara. 137, 172-7, 203-7, 274-80; Sirm. 167-70, 210-34).
	[Sis, AV, A] RIC 184.
	[Sis, An, A] RIC 242 (Sirm. 492-4).
	[Byz, AV, A] Manns (1939), 41.
	[Byz, An, A] RIC 408 (Mara. 598-600; Sirm. 1272-80
1b. VIRT MILITVM	[Med, An, A] RIC 148 (Mara. 282-99; Sirm. 327-49).
	[Byz, An, A] RIC 407 Mara. 601-2, 631 Sirm. 1281-1307
	[Rom, An, A] RIC 56 (Mara. 23-5; Sirm. 20)
1c. VIRTVS AVG	[Med, An, A] RIC 149 (Mara. 132-6; Sirm. 166).
	[Sis, An, A] RIC 241 (Sirm. 495-501).
1d. VIRTVS MILITVM	[Tre, AV, T(+T2)] S.58 (E.866).

2. (Emp. on horseback, holding spear; r. hand raised)

2a. VIRTVS MILITVM	[Sis, An, A] RIC 212.
2b. VIRTVS AVG	[Sis, An, A] RIC 211.
	[Med, An, A] RIC 116.
2c. VIRTVS EQUIT	[Med, AV, A] RIC 100 (Milan 10).
	[Med, An, A] RIC 115 (Cohen 287).

(*1) NOTE: RIC 149 (VIRTVS AVG) should have preceded RIC 147 (VIRTVS MILITVM) in the catalogue; the error has made a nonsense of Webb's "as above" under nos. 147-8.

NOTE TO REFERENCES: Mara. = Maravelle; Sirm. = Sirmium.

NOTE TO ICONOGRAPHY: The iconog. of no.2 is very similar to that found on many ADVENTVS types for Aurelian and others (see e.g. Milan 9, 25-9, 40).

TABLE A:7

The Legionary Issue of Victorinus

Legion	Iconography	Elmer	Schulte	Notes
Obv. IMP VICTORINVS PF AVG:				
LEG PRIMA MINERVA PF	(Victoria with ram)	E.711	S.29	
LEG II TRAIANA PF	(Hercules)	E.713	S.31	
LEG III GALLICA PF	(Bull)	(E.714)	S.32	(a)
LEG III PARTHICA PF	(Centaur)	E.714a	(S.32 n.)	(b)
LEG X FRETENSIS PF	(Bull)	E.717	S.35	
LEG X GEMINA PF	(Dioscuri)	E.718	S.36	
LEG XIII GEMINA PF	(Lion)	E.719	S.37	
LEG XX VAL VICTRIX	(Boar)	E.721	S.39	(c)
LEG XXX VLP VICT PF	(Jupiter & Capricorn)	E.725	S.42-3	(d)
		E.727	S.45	(c/d)
Obv. IMP C VICTORINVS PF AVG:				
LEG II AVGVSTA PF	(Pegasus)	E.712	S.30	
LEG IIII FLAVIA PF	(2 lions & bust of Africa in elephant cap)	E.715	S.33	
LEG V MACEDONICA PF	(Bull, eagle on globe)	E.716	S.34	
LEG XIIII GEMINA PF	(Capricorn, with eagle on globe)	E.720	(S.38)	(e)
LEG XX VAL VICTRIX PF	(Boar)	E.722	S.40	(c)
LEG XXII PF	(Hercules & Capricorn)	E.723	S.41	(f)
LEG XXX VLP VICT PF	(Jupiter & Capricorn)	E.726	S.44	
		E.728	S.46	(c)

NOTES: (References to Lafaurie = Lafaurie (1975), 934.)

(a) E.714 gives the wrong obv. legend (corrected by Lafaurie; Elmer's error not noted by Schulte).
(b) E.714a not included in Schulte's catalogue due to lack of pictorial evidence (cf. Drinkwater (1987), 180 n.214).
(c) The rev. die links between the two obv. types (S.39/40; S.45/46) prove that one mint (probably Col., see Ch.4 n.21) was involved.
(d) Lafaufie wrongly has "VICTRIX" for E.725/727.
(e) Schulte (S.38) gives incorrect obv. legend (cf. his pl.19, 38a).
(f) A variant of E.723 with rev. legend LEG XXII PRIMIGEN PF (same iconography [Absch] E.724/RIC 91) is rejected by Schulte (S.41 n.).

TABLE A:8

Victory types specifying the vanquished foe

Joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus:

[Rom]:
- VICTORIA GERM (+c) [An, V] RIC 132; [AV] Göbl (1951), 21.
- VICTORIA GERM (+c) [An, G] RIC 174-5; [AV] Göbl (1951), 21.
- VICTORIAE AVGG IT GERM (+c) [An, V] RIC 129; [An, G] RIC 178-9.
- VICTORIA GERMANICA (+c) [An, G] RIC 180 (Cunetio 598; Göbl, -).
- VICTORIA GERMANICA (Vict. crowns emp) [AEm, G] Göbl (1951), 27.

[Vim]:
- VICTORIA GERMANICA (+ shield) [An, V] RIC 263 (Cunetio 760).
- VICT GERM (+c) [An, G] RIC 404 (Cunetio 785);
- VICT GERM (+c) [AV, G] Göbl (1951), 30.
- VICT PART (+c) [An, V] RIC 262 (Cunetio 787);
- VICT PART (+c) [AV, V] Göbl (1951), 30.

[Tre]:
- VICT PARTICA (+c) [An, V] E.12b (RIC 22).
- VICT GERMANICA (+ trophy) [An, G] E. 20, 27, 34, 41, 48, 56, 59d.
- VICT GERMANICA (on globe +2c) [An, G] E.21, 28, 35, 42, 49, 57, 59e
- VICTORIA GERMANICA (do.) [An, G] E. 22, 29, 36, 43, 50, 58, 59f.
- VICT GERMANICA (+c) [An, G] E. 83, 88; [AV] E.93; [AE] E.95.
- VICT GERMANICA [An, G] E. 84, 89, [AV] E.94.

[Sam]:
- VICTORIA PART (Vict. crowns emp.) [An, G] RIC 453.
- VICTORIA PART (do.) [An, V2] RIC 54 (Cunetio 833).
- VICTORIA GERMAN (do.) [An, V2] RIC 53 (Cunetio 832).
- VICTORIA GERMAN (do.) [An, G] RIC 452 (Cunetio 839-40; cf. RIC 451).

Western emperors (Postumus only):

[Tre]:
- VICTORIA GERMANICA [An, P] E.317 (Cunetio 2410).
- VICT GERMANICA [AV, P] RIC 102 (E.-; Cohen, 371; Schulte (1983), 172 'b').
- VIC GERM PM TRP V COS III PP (Vict. crowns emp.) [AV, P] E.354-6 (S.75; S.74; S.72, 76).

Reign of Aurelian:

[Sis]:
- VICTORIA PARTICA (Vict. crowns emp.) [An, A] RIC 240.

[Cyz]:
- VICTORIA GERN <sic> [An, A] RIC 355 (cf. Manns (1939), 33).
- VICTORIAE GOTHIC (Trophy between 2 captives) [An, A] RIC 339 (Normanby 1283).

NOTE TO ICONOGRAPHY: Unless specified, = standard Victoria type: Vict. with wreath and palm; "+c", "+2c" = with (two) captive(s).

TABLE A:9

Imperial Virtus II:
The correlation between "Virtus" types
and types referring to Mars
(entries 1-5)

1. (Emp./Mars standing armoured, helm., spear & shield)

1a. VIRTVS AVGG	[Rom, jr, AV/An/AE V/G] Göbl (1951), 20-24.
	[Ant, jr, An, V/G] Göbl (1951), 35-6.
1b. VIRTVS AVG	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 13.
	[Med, sr, AV/An, G] Göbl (1953), 20-21.
	[Ant, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 27-9.
	[Tre, AE, P] E. 267-8, 273 (B. 9, 50-57 etc.)
	[Col, An, M] E.640 (Cunetio 2512).
	[Tre, An, V] Cunetio 2550 (E.-).
	[Rom, An, A] RIC 41.
	[Cyz, An, A] RIC 341.
1c. VIRTVS MIL	[Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 18.
1d. MARS AVG	[Cyz, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 30.
1e. MARS VICTOR	[Tre, An, P] E.389 (Cunetio 2422).

2. (As 1, but walking, carrying shield)

2a. MARTI PROPVGNATORI	[Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 49-49a
2b. MARTI PROPVNATORI	[Sis, sr, AV, G] Siscia 8 (Göbl (1953), 25).
2c. VIRTVS AEQVIT	[Med, AV/An, P] S.165 (E.602); E. 605, 608.
2d. VIRTVS EQVIT	[Med, AV, P] S.164 (E.611).
	[Med, An, P] E. 608, 611, 614, 617.

3. (As 1/2, but at feet, a captive/enemy)

3a. VIRTVS AVG	[Tre, An/AE, P] E.292; RIC 181-2 (B. 4, 8).
3b. VIRT GALLIENI AVG	[Tre, jr, AV/An, G] E.92; E. 82, 87.
	[Med, jr, An, G] Cunetio 754-5.
3c. MARTI PROPVGNAT	[Med, jr, An, G] RIC 483.

4. (As 1, but also with olive branch; often without shield)

4a. MARTI PACIFERO	[Rom, sr, AV/An/Den G] Göbl (1953), 15.
	[Med, sr, An G] Göbl (1953), 20.
4b. MARTI PROPVGNAT	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 16 (no shield).
4c. MARTI PACIF	[Rom, jr, AE, G] Göbl (1951), 19 (no spear).
	[Rom, An, A] RIC 33 (Normanby 1249).
4d. MARTI PACIFERO	[Med, AVm, A] Milan 1.
	[Med, AV, A] Milan 5 (Manns (1939), 17).
4e. MARTI PACI	[Med, AV, A] Milan 12; [An] RIC 112.
	[Ser, An, A] RIC 270-71.
4f. VIRTVS AVG	[Tre, An, A] E.887 (RIC 5).
	[Cyz, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 30 (no shield).
4g. VIRTVS AVG(VSTI)	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 16 (no shield).

5. (As 4, but walking)

5a. MARTI PACIFERO	[Vim, jr, An, V] Göbl (1951), 28.
5b. MARTI PACIFE	[Med, sr, An G] Göbl (1953), 20.

[Continued over...

6. (As 1 or 2, without shield, trophy over l. shoulder)

6a. VIRTVS AVGG	[Rom, jr, An, V/G] Göbl (1951), 22-4.
6b. VIRTVS AVGG	[Vim, jr, An, V/G] Göbl (1951), 29.
6c. MARTI PROPVG	[Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 18.
6d. FIDES EXERCITI	[Byz, An, A] RIC 393 (Maravelle 584).
6e. VIRTVS AVG	[Tre, An, P] E.291.
6f. VIRTVS AEQVIT	[Med, An, P] (without helm) Normanby 1355-7.

7. (As 6, but nude)

7a. MARS VICTOR	[Col, An, Vi] E.739-40.
	[Tre? An, T] Besly & Bland (1983), 64 (cf. E.794; St-Mard 3196).
7b. PMTRPVIICOSIIIIPP	[Tre, jr, AV/An, G] E.91; E. 81, 86.
7c. PMTRPIIIICOSIIIPP	[Tre, AV/An, P] S.56 (E.321); E.332.
7d. PMTBPVICOSIIPP	[Sis? AV, A] RIC 186 (cf. Manns (1939), 54).
7e. PMTBPVIICOSIIPP	[Rom? AV, A] Manns (1939), 54 (cf. RIC 16).
7f. VIRTVS AVG	[Sis, sr, An, G] Sisela 115
	[Rom, AV, A] Manns (1939), 15 (cf. RIC 97).
	[Rom? An, A] Bastien (1976), 36 (cf. RIC 1).
	[Sis, AV, A] RIC 179-81 (Manns (1939), 44).
	[Sis, AVm, A] RIC 165 (Gnecchi I, 9, no.4).
7g. VIRTVS AVGVSTI	[Sis, AV, A] Manns (1939), 16 (cf. RIC 98).

8. (As 6 or 7, but at feet, a captive/enemy; cf.3)

8a. VIRTVS AVG	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 13.
	[Med, AV, A] Milan 32, 37-9 (cf. RIC 15).
	[Sis, AV, A] RIC 182-3.
8b. VIRTVS ILLVRICI	[Ant, AV/An, A] RIC 378-80; RIC 388.

9. (As 1 or 2, but nude; cf. 8)

9a. VIRTVS AVG	[Tre, An, P] E.190.
	[Ant, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 29.
9b. MARS VICTOR	[Ant, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 28.
9c. COMES AVG	[Col, An, Vi] Normanby 1444 (E.-; RIC 42).

10. (Bust of emp./Mars, helmeted)

10a. COMES AVG	[Col? AV, Vi] E.705 (S.48).
10b. VIRTVS AVG	[Rom, sr, AV, G] Göbl (1953), 13
	[Tre, AE, P] B.106-7 (E. 285, 283).
10c. VIRTVS POSTVMI AVG	[Tre, AV, P] S. 9, 19-20 (E. 181, 177, 308).
10d. VIRTVS POSTVMI AVG	<obv.> [Tre, AV, P] S.10-11 (E. 168, 174).
	[Tre, AE, P] B.108-11 (also 112-15).

TABLE A:10

Imperial Virtus III:
The emperor as victorious army commander
(cf. table A:6)

1. (Emp. rides down and spears enemy, "St. George-style") *1

1a. VIRT GALLIENI AVG	(Med, sr, An, G) Göbl (1953), 18.
1b. VIRTVS AVG	(Rom, sr, An, G) Göbl (1953), 13.
	(Sis, sr, An, G) Sisc Ia 113-4.
	(Sis, AV/An, A) Manns (1939), 11.
1c. VIRTVS AVGVSTI	(Col? AE, V) E.730.
1d. INVICTVS AVG	(Tre, AV, V) S.28 (E.659).
1e. ADVENTVS AVG	(Rom, An, A) RIC 42 (cf. Siscium 17).

2. (Emp. cuirassed with battle-axe)

2a. VIRTVTI AVG	(Cyz, sr, An G) Göbl (1953), 30.
2b. VICTORIA AVG	(Cyz, sr, An G) Göbl (1953), 31.

3. (Emp. cuirassed, walking with standard as signifer)

3a. VIRTVS GALLIENI AVGVSTI	(Rom, sr, Ag-m, G) Gnecchi I, 8, no.19.
3b. VIRTVS AVGVSTI	(Rom, sr, An, G) Göbl (1953), 14.
	(Sis, sr, An, G) Sisc Ia 116.
3c. VIRTVS AVG	(Sis, sr, An, G) Sisc Ia 108.

4. (Emp. cuirassed with spear & milit. standard)

4a. VIRTVS AVGG	(Vim, Jr, An, G) Göbl (1951), 29.
	(Tre, Jr, An, G) E.54 (Göbl (1951), 32).

5. (Emp. cuirassed, with spear, holding victory which crowns him) *2

5a. VIRTVS AVGG	(Tre, Jr, AV/An, V) E.79; E.76.
5b. VIRTVS AVG	(Vim, Jr, An, V) Göbl (1951), 27 (+ shield).
	(Tre, AV, V) S.51 (E.-) (+ shield).

6. (Emp. cuirassed with spear, crowns trophy)

6a. VIRTVS AVGG	(Vim, Jr, An, V/G) Göbl (1951), 28-9.
6b. VIRTVS AVG	(Sis, sr, An, G) Sisc Ia 110 (+ captive).
	(Tre, Absch, V) S.56 (+ 2 capt./Victoria).

7. (Trophy between captives or heap of weapons [spoils])

7a. GERMANICVS MAX V	(Tre, Jr, An, G) E.19 etc. (see Ch.3, n.18).
7b. VIRTVTI AVG	(Cyz, sr, An, G) Göbl (1953), 30.
7c. VIRTVS AVGVSTI	(Sis, AV, A) Manns (1939), 16 (cf. RIC 99).
7d. GERMANICVS MAX V	(Tre, AE, P) B.301-2 (see Ch.3, n.20).
7e. PMTRPCOSIIIPP	(Tre, AV, P) S.43-6 (see Ch.3, n.20).
7f. VIRTVS EXERCITVS	(Tre, AV, P) RIC 44 (spoils: see Ch.4, n.10).

---

*1. NOTE: For iconography no. 1 (emperor as cavalry commander), see also table A:2, no.3; cf. table A:6, no.2.

*2. NOTE: For iconography no. 5 (emperor crowned by small victory), cf. table A:6, no.1. Note also Ch.4.b, n.34.

TABLE A:11

Imperial Virtus IV:
The correlation between 'Virtus' types and types referring to Hercules

1. (Herc. leans on club, back of his hand rests on hip)

1a. VIRTVS AVG	[Sis, sr, An, G] Sisc|a 109.
	[Ser, QAV, A] Manns (1939), 56.
1b. VIRTVS AVGVSTI	[Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 18.
	[Ant, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 27-8.
1c. VIRTVTI AVGVSTI	[Rom, sr, An, G] Normanby 299.
	[Tre, An, P] E.390 (Cunetio 2441-3).
	[Tre, AV, T] S.31 (E.834).
1d. VIRTVS EQVITVM	[Med, An, P] E.619 (Cunetio 2497).
1e. HERC DEVSONIENSI	[Tre, AV, P] S.37-8 (E. 304, 325b).
1f. HERCVLI MAGVSANO	[Tre, An/AE, P] E.287; E.293 (B.105).

2. (Herc. with club and bow)

2a. VIRTVS AVG	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 13.
	[Rom, An, A] RIC 58.
	[Tre, An, P] E.126 (Cunetio 2377).
2b. HERCVLI DIVSONIENSI	[Tre, AV/AE P] S.3 (E.121a); E.118a (B.1).
2c. HERC DIVSONIENSI	[Tre, AV, P] S.4 (E.121).
	[An] E. 124, 131 (Cunetio 2378-9, 2382-4).
	[AE] B. 103-4, 113, 118 (E. 223, 220, 222).

3. (Herc. brandishes club)

3a. VIRTVS AVG	[Rom, An, A] RIC 57 (Manns (1939), 43).

4. (Herc. with club and trophy)

4a. HERCVLI DEVSONIENSI	[Tre, AE, P] B.132 (E.184).

5. (Herc. with club and branch)

5a. VIRT GALLIENI AVG	[Med, sr, Quat, G] Göbl (1953), 21.
5b. HERCULI PACIFERO	[Tre, An, P] E.299 (Cunetio 2394-5).

6. (Herc. leans on club, holding globe)

6a. VIRTVS AVG	[Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 20.

7. (As 6, but receives globe from Sol with captive)

7a. VIRTVS AVG	[Ser, An, A] RIC 318 (Manns (1939), 56).

8. (As 7, but emp., without club, in place of Herc.)

8a. VIRTVS AVG	[Ser, An, A] RIC 316-7.

9. (Weapons of Herc.: bow, club, quiver)

9a. VIRTVS FALERI	[Rom, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 13.
9b. HERCVLI ROMANO AVG	[Tre, An, P] E.558-9 (Cunetio 23).
9c. PMTRPVIIICOSIIIIPP	[Tre, An, P] E.560-1 (Cunetio 2445, 2447).

TABLE A:12

Postumus' "Labours of Hercules" series and related material

I: The "Labours" series (AD 266/7 or 268?)*

Legend	(Iconog.)	[AV] E.	S.		References: Travaux	E.	S.	[AE/Absch] Travaux
HERCVLI NAMEO	Lion	521	120	1				
		523	121	2		523	122	5
		522	123	3				
		524	124	4				
HERCVLI ARGIVO	Hydra	473	125	6				
HERCVLI ARGIVO	Hydra					475	126	7-9
HERCVLI ARGIVO	Hydra					476	127	10-12
HERCVLI ARCADIO	Hind					467	128	13
HERCVLI ERVMANTINO	Boar 1					493	129-31	14-7
HERCVLI ERVMANTINO	Boar 1					492	132	18-20
HERCVLI ERVMANTINO	Boar 2	-	133	21				
HERCVLI ERVMANTINO	Boar 2				[An]	-	(134)	22
HERCVLI PISAEO	Pickaxe					530	135	(cf.23-5)
HERCVLI AVG	Birds	481	136	26				
HERCVLI CRETENSI	Bull	488	137	27				
HERCVLI THRACIO	Horses	538	138	28				
HERCVLI THRACIO	Horses					541	139	29
HERCVLI THRACIO	Horses					543	140	30
HERCVLI INVICTO	Amazon 1	512	142	32				
HERCVLI INVICTO	Amazon 1					509	141	31
HERCVLI INVICTO	Amazon 1					511	143	33-40
HERCVLI INVICTO	Amazon 2				[An]	-	(144-6)	41-4
HERCVLI GADITANO	Geryon					499	147	45-6
HERCVLI ROM	Apples					535	148	47
HERCVLI ROM	Apples					534	149	48-50
HERCVLI LIBYCO	Antaeus	517	150	51				
HERCVLI LIBYCO	Antaeus					519	151	-
HERCVLI INMORTALI	Cerberus					504	152	52
HERCVLI INMORTALI	Cerberus					505	153	53-4

[Cont. over...

TABLE A:12 (cont.)

Postumus' "Labours of Hercules" series
and related material

II: Other types sharing "Labours" iconography

IIa. Outside the main series, issued earlier (AD 262)*

Legend	(Iconog.)	[AV] E.	S.	References: Travaux	[AE] (None)
HERCVLI INVICTO	Lion	305	36	-	
HERCVLI INVICTO	Lion	327	40	-	

IIb. Outside main series, issued slightly later (AD 268?)*

Legend	(Iconog.)	[AV] (None)	References: E.	S.	Travaux	[AE] B.
HERCVLI INVICTO	Bull		556	-	-	136
VIRTVS POSTVMI AVG	Hind		557	-	-	137
VIRTVS POSTVMI AVG	Hind		-	-	-	138

KEY TO REVERSE ICONOGRAPHY ("Labours of Hercules"):
Lion: Wrestles with Nemean Lion
Hydra: Clubs Lernean Hydra
Hind: Wrestles with Cerynean Hind, grasping antlers from behind
Boar 1: Strides towards amphora, Erymanthian Boar over his shoulder
Boar 2: As "Boar 1", but standing; no amphora
Pickaxe: Wields pick to divert the Alpheus into the Augean stables
Birds: Aims bow at sky; at r, 2 falling Stymphalian birds
Bull: Grasps Cretan Bull by the horns
Horse: Seizes one of the horses of Diomedes; another gallops free
Amazon 1: Stands over dead Amazon, with club; r. hand holds girdle
Amazon 2: As "Amazon 1", but without girdle
Geryon: Fights the giant Geryon
Apples: Stands under apple tree; 3 Hesperides flee to left
Antaeus: Holds the struggling Antaeus aloft
(a "labour" supernumerary to the canonical twelve)
Cerberus: Walks, club shouldered, leading Cerberus by a chain

* NOTES ON THE DATES OF ISSUE (taking 260 as date of P's revolt):
I ("Labours"): The date is very uncertain. For discussion see Elmer (1941), 38; Bastien (1958), 72; Bastien (1967), 56ff.; Schulte (1983), 43f.; Drinkwater (1987), 173f.
IIa: Schulte's "Group 5", see Schulte (1983), 32.
IIb: Issued at the end of (or slightly later than) the "Labours" series: Bastien (1967), 56ff.; Drinkwater (1987), 173 n.160.

TABLE A:13

The Emperor and the Eternity of Rome
ROMAE AETERNAE and other related types
(Entries 1-10)

1. (She-wolf and twins)

1a. AETERNITAS AVG	[Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 628.
	[Cyz, An, A] RIC 326 (Manns (1939), 18).
1b. AETERNIT AVG	[Cyz, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 30 (RIC 628).

2. (Mars, nude, helmeted with spear & shield; Rhea Silvia reclining)

2a. TRIBPOTVIIICOSIII	[Med, Jr, Absch, G] RIC 315 (Göbl (1951), 34).

3. (Roma, seated with shield, holding spear and victriola)

3a. ROMAE AETERNAE	[Ant, Jr, An, V] RIC 221 (Göbl (1951), 35-6).
	[Ant, jr, An, G] RIC 297 (" " ").
	[Ant, jr, AV, V] RIC 275 (Göbl (1951), 38).
	[Ant, jr, AV, G] RIC 432-3 (" " ").
	[Sam, jr, An, Sa] Göbl (1951), 37.
	[Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 654-5.
3b. ROMAE AETERN(AE)	[Cyz, sr, An, G] RIC 655 (Göbl(1953), 30).
3c. ROMAE AETERNE<sic>	[Cyz, An, A] RIC 337 (Blackmoor 3784).

4. (As 3, but sceptre in place of spear)

4a. ROMAE AETERNAE	[Tre, AV, T] S.18 (E.831).
4b. ROMAE AETER	[Sis, AV, A] RIC 175 (Rohde 37; Cohen 217).

5. (As 4, but without shield)

5a. PMTRPVICOS	[Med, sr, An, G] Cunetio 1669 (Göbl (1953), 21).

6. (As 4, but holds paladium instead of vict., shield under throne)

6a. ROMAE AETERNAE	[Tre, AV, P] S.48-53A (E.366).
	[Tre, AV, P] S.47 (E.368).

7. (Roma, seated on cuirass, holds spear and vict.)

7a. ROMA AET(ER)	[Rom, AE, A] RIC 84-5 (cf. Manns (1939), 52; Gnecchi III, 65, nos. 15-6).

8. (As 7, but Roma holds olive branch instead of vict.)

8a. VIRTVS AVG	[Tre, AV, T] E.833 (S.20-22, 24; RIC 39).
	[Tre, Absch, T] S.23. (RIC 177; E.833).

9. (Roma, stg helmeted, holding spear & shield resting on ground)

9a. VIRTVS AVGG	[Tre, An, T] Normanby 1485 (E.780; RIC 148; Cunetio 2618; Hunter 12).

10. (Roma, stg helmeted, holding spear & olive branch, foot on globe)

10a. PMTRPIIICOSPP	[Tre, AV, T] E.825 (S.48; RIC -).

[Continued over...

TABLE A:13 (Cont.)

The Emperor and the Eternity of Rome
ROMAE AETERNAE and other related types
(Entries 11-18)

11. (Draped, helmetd bust of Roma)
11a. ROMA AETERNE<sic> [Tre, sr, Absch, V] E.71 (Göbl (1951), 33).
[Tre, AV, P] S.24 (E.-).
11b. ROMAE AETERNAE [Tre, AV, Vi] E.665 (S.16); E.664 (S.17).
[Tre, AV, Vi] S.17A (cf. E.664).
[Tre, Absch, Vi] S.17n.

12. (Jugate busts of Roma and Diana)
12a. VOTA AVGVSTI [AV, Vi] S.24-6 (E. 671, 673, 672).

13. (Emp. stg & spear, receives vict. from Roma, stg. spear & shield)
13a. VIRTVS AVG [Ant, jr+, An, G] Cunetio 1878
(cf. RIC [Jr] 457). (*1)

14. (Roma [as 3] holds out vict. to emp.)
14a. ROMAE AETERNAE [Ant, jr, An, Sa] RIC 67 (Göbl (1951), 38;
Cunetio 856, 871, 877;).
[Ant, jr+, An, G] Cunetio 1872, 1876;
(cf. RIC (Jr) 449). (*1)
[Med, An, A] RIC 142 (Maraveille 138-41;
Sirmium 172-7).
[Med, An, A] RIC 142 (Maraveille 181-5, 209;
Sirmium 235-44).
14b. ROMAE AETER [Med, An, A] RIC 142 (Maraveille 322-38;
Sirmium 356-65;
Blackmoor 3722-4).

15. (As 14, but Roma with sceptre [as 4])
15a. ROMAE AETERNAE [Byz, An, A] RIC 405.

16. (As 14, but Roma seated on cuirass [as 7] and clasps emp.'s hand)
16a. PMTRPVICOSIIIPP [Tre, AV, P] E.392 (S.97). (*2)

17. (Emp., followed by signifer, offers globe to seated Roma, [as 3])
17a. COS II [Col(?) AV, Vi] E.704 (S.47).

18. (Roma leading mounted emp. back from victorious wars)
18a. ROMA REDVX [Tre, jr, AV, G] E.73 (Göbl (1951), 33).

(*1) NOTE: On these [jr+] types see Besly & Bland (1983), p.40f.
(*2) NOTE: Elmer cites another with the same legend: PM TRP VI COS III PP [Tre, AV, P] E.391 (pl.6, 4), with a different iconography (Cult statue of Dea Roma in tetrastyle temple: cf. the similar iconography for the Licinii, E. 77, 90, 99, etc.); however, Schulte (1983), does not include it.

TABLE A:14

Aurelian and Jovian Investiture

1. (Emp. + short sceptre receiving globe from Jup. + long sceptre)

IOVI CONSERVATORI	[Med, An]	Mara. 148-9, 187-91; Sirm. 179-80 (cf. RIC 131).
	[Sis, AV]	RIC 174 (Manns (1939), 28).
	[Sis, An]	RIC 227 (Mara. 402-4, 408-10; Sirm. 459-78).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 265-6 (Estiot (1983), 27).
	[Byz, An]	Mara. 585-6; Sirm. 1209 (cf. RIC 395; Estiot (1983), 29).
IOVI CONSER	[Med, An]	RIC 129 (Mara. 214-16, 219-23, 226; Sirm. 267-84; cf. RIC 130).
	[Sis, An]	RIC 225 (Mara. 420-2, 426, 428-9, 432-7, 439-49, 452-3, 456, 461-2; Sirm. 513, cf. 514-15; 516-683).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 260 (Mara. 558; Sirm. 1380-90; Mara. 561-2; Sirm. 1391-1410; Mara. 559-60; Sirm. 1413-14; Mara. 563-5; Sirm. 1415-45).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 259 (Sirm. 1411-12).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 262 (Sirm. 1448; cf. 1447).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 263.
	[Ser, An]	RIC 264 (Sirm. 1446).
	[Ser, An]	RIC 261 (Mara. 566; Sirm. 1449-57).
	[Byz, An]	RIC 394 var. (Estiot (1983), 29).
	[Cyz, An]	RIC 346 (Mara. 639-41; Sirm. 1604-14).
CONCORD MILIT	[Cyz, An]	RIC 342 (Mara. 636-8; Sirm. 1571-84; 1587-8).
FIDES MILIT	[Cyz, An]	RIC 344 (Mara. 634-5; Sirm. 1546-65; 1585-6).

2. (As before, but emp. without sceptre)

IOVI CONSERVATORI	[Med, An]	Mara. 117; Sirm. 154-6 (cf. RIC 131).
IOVI CONSER	[Sis, An]	RIC 225 (Mara. 431; Sirm. 709-13).

3. (As before, emp. with eagle-topped sceptre)

IOVI CONSER	[Med, An]	RIC 129 (Mara. 217-18, 224, 227; Sirm. 285-7).

4. (As before, emp. with long sceptre)

IOVI CONSER	[Rom, An]	RIC 48 (Sirm. 24).
	[Sis, An]	RIC 225 (Mara. 457-9, 463-5, 467-8; Sirm. 684-708).
	[Byz, An]	RIC 394 (Mara. 593-7; 617; 618-23; Sirm. 1240-71; 1334; 1335-6).

NOTE TO REFERENCES: Mara. = Maravelille; Sirm. = Sirmium.

(See also Ch.4, n.127, for the Sol type: RIC 274-5.)

TABLE A:15

Aurelian and Sol I:
ORIENS AVG antoninlani for Aurelian
Arranged according to mint and order of output with each mint
(Rome, Milan, Ticinum)

Rev.	Mark	Obv.	RIC	Maravielle	Sirmium
[Rom]:					
Sol 3b	--//P (to VI)	4 (B1)	(247)	28	28
Sol 3b	--//-	" (D11)	(")	32	-
Sol 3a	--//P (to VI)	" (B1)	(")	27, 29	25-6
Sol 2c	--//VI (+?)	" (D1)	(249)	-	42
Sol 2c	--//P (to VI)	" (B1)	(")	30-1	43-50
Sol 1e	" "	" (")	(247)	35, 46-8	29-31
Sol 3b	" " (V?)	5 (")	(248)	-	-
Sol 3a	" " (V?)	" (")	(")	-	27
Sol 2c	" " (S, Q?)	" (")	(250)	33	51
Sol 1e	" "	" (")	(248)	34, 36-45, 49-53	32-41
Sol 3c	--//P (to X)	4 (")	62	54-9	54-62
Sol 3c	(some of above)	3 (")	61	-	52-3
Sol 3c	XXI/P//lion (to VII)	4 (")	62	-	-
Sol 3c	-P//XXI to (VII)	" (")	62	60-4	137-9
Sol 4	T-//XXI (+?)	" (")	-	-	-
Sol 1f	-P//XXI* (to VII)	" (")	63	65-9	140
Sol 1f	--//XXIA (+?)	" (")	63	70	-
Sol 3d	" (+?)	" (")	62	71	-
Sol 3c	--//AXXI (to Z)	" (")	62	72-84	136
Sol 5	A-//XXI (to Z)	" (")	65	85-7	135
Sol 1d	--//AXXIR (B,Δ,ϵ)	" (")	63	(88)	117-24
Sol 6b	A-//XXIR to I (ς?)	" (")	64	(90-1, 100)	63-71
Sol 6a	(as above)	" (")	64	94-8, 101-4	72-115
Sol 6a	H-//XXIR	" (Bg)	(64)	-	116
[Med]:					
Sol 1e	--//P (to Q)	5 (B1)	135	343-6	384-406
Sol 3c	--//P (to Q)	4 (")	137	347-8	-
Sol 3c	--//PM (to Q)	3 (")	150	349-55	407-9
[Tic]:					
Sol 3c	*-//PXXI (to Q)	3 (B1)	(151)	356-9	411-14
Sol 3c	(as above)	" (")	(")	362-3, 365-8	424-36
Sol 3c	(as above)	" (")	151	-	-

[Continued over...

TABLE A:15 (Cont.)

Aurelian and Sol I:
ORIENS AVG antoniniani for Aurelian
(Siscia, Serdica, Cyzicus)

Rev.	Mark	Obv.	RIC	Maravielle	Sirmium
[Sis]:					
Sol 1a	*/P (+? to VII)	3 (B1)	246	-	1073
Sol 1b	*/V (+? to VII)	" (")	246	-	1075
Sol 3c	*/P (all to VII?)	" (")	254	-	-
Sol 1b	*/S (all to VI?)	" (")	246	514	-
Sol 1c	*/S (Q,VI, +?)	" (")	251	-	1076-9
Sol 3c	*/S to VI (P?)	" (")	254	518, 520-1	1080-91
Sol 4	*/S (T, +?)	" (")	255	-	1092-5
Sol 3c	--//XXIP (+?)	" (")	254	-	1158
Sol 4	S-//XXIVI (+?)	" (")	255	527	-
Sol 4	--//XXIP (to VI)	" (")	255	534, 539, 546, 550-1	1159-65, 1167-78
Sol 4	--//SXX.I (to VI,+?)	" (")	(255)	557	1166
Sol 4	V-//XXI (to VI +?)	" (")	(255)	554	1186-90
[Ser]:					
Sol 2a	--//S (P?)	5 (B1)	(277)	-	1458
Sol 2b	--//P (S)	4 (")	276	568	1460-9
Sol 7	--//P (S,T?)	" (")	-	-	1470
Sol 3c	--//P (to T)	3 (")	278	567	1471-83
Sol 3c	--//P (to T)	4 (")	279	569-70	1484-93
Emp/Sol	--//Q (+?)	4 (B1)	282	-	-
Sol 3c	--//XXIP (to T)	4 (")	279	571, 573	1494-9
Sol 3c	--//XXI.S. (T, P?)	" (Bg)	279	574	-
Sol 3c	(as above)	" (B2)	279	-	1500
Emp/Sol	--//XXIT (+?)	4 (B1)	283	-	-
[Cyz]:					
Sol 2b	--//CA (toϵ; B?)	4 (B1)	(361)	664	1710-11
Sol 3b	--//CA (toϵ; A,Δ?)	3 (B1)	360	-	1705-9
Sol 2b	--//AC (toϵ)	" (")	360	-	1723-9
Sol 3b	(as above)	" (")	360	655-6, 663, 665-6	1712-21
Sol 3c	(as above)	" (")	363	660	1730-40
Sol 3c	--//ΔC (+?)	5 (")	365	-	1741-2
Sol 2b	-A//XXI (toϵ)	3 (")	360	670	1751-8
Sol 2b	- //XXI (+?)	4 (")	(361)	-	1759-61
Sol 3b	--//XXI	3 (D2)	(360)	-	1743
Sol 3b	-A//XXI (toϵ)	3 (B1)	360	667-9	1744-50
Sol 3c	Γ-//XXI (+?)	" (")	(363)	-	1762
Sol 3c	A-//XXI (toϵ)	4 (")	364	671	1763-8

[Continued over...

TABLE A:15 (Cont.)

Aurelian and Sol I:
ORIENS AVG antoninlani for Aurelian
(Keys to table)

KEY TO OBV.

LEGEND (cf. RIC):
3: IMP C AVRELIANVS AVG
4: IMP AVRELIANVS AVG
5: AVRELIANVS AVG.

BUST (cf. Cunetio):
D1 = Draped bust r. (D1l = left.); D2 = same, from rear.
B1 = Cuirassed bust r.; B2 = same, from rear.
Bg = Cuirassed (with gorgoneion), spear (or scptr.) over l. shlder.

IN MINT MARKS:

(+?) indicates other officinae possible, but not certainly attested.

KEY TO REV.

Sol 1a Sol stg l., head r., cloak on l. shoulder, r.h. raised, globe in l.h.; at feet to l., captive with hands on knees.
Sol 1b Sol as above; captive as above, but hands bound behind back.
Sol 1c As 1b, but Sol frontal; and at feet, to r., another bound captive, whose head is turned back to look up at Sol.
Sol 1d As 1c, but both captives look up at Sol.
Sol 1e As 1b (one captive), but Sol's cloak on both shoulders and draped over l. arm.
Sol 1f As 1c (two captives), but Sol's cloak as in 1e.
Sol 2a As 1a, but Sol stg and looking l.
Sol 2b As 2a, but captive bound (as in 1b).
Sol 2c As 2a, but Sol's cloak as in 1e; the captive lies on his back, propped up on his elbow, l.h. extended towards Sol.
Sol 3a As 2a, but Sol striding (foot somtimes on captive's back).
Sol 3b Sol as 3a, but captive as 1b/2b.
Sol 3c Sol as 3a, but two captives as 1c.
Sol 3d As 3c, but Sol's cloak flies out behind.
Sol 4 As 3d, but Sol carries whip not globe.
Sol 5 Sol, cloak over arm, striding to r., trophy (or standard?) in r.h., globe in l.h., trampling a captive falling to r., whose head is turned back towards Sol, and r. arm up in supplication or self-defence.
Sol 6a As 5, but Sol carries olive branch in r.h., bow in l.h.
Sol 6b As 6a, but captive falling forward, arms out before him.
Sol 7 Sol stg r. trampling prostrate captive with both feet, holding globe in r.h., sword or club(?) in l.h.
Emp/Sol Emp receives globe from Sol, holding whip.

TABLE A:16

Aurelian and Sol II:
Sol as Aurelian's principal tutelary deity
(Entries 1-6)

1. (Sol radiate with cloak, with no attributes, r.h. raised)

1a. SOLI INVICTO	[Ser, An] (Sol) RIC 311.

2. (Sol radiate with cloak, globe in l.h., streaches out raised r.h.)

2a. SOLI INVICTO	[Rom, An] RIC 54 (Mara. 16-18; Sirm. 21-3).
	[Ant, An] RIC 387 (Syria B 18).
2b. RESTITVTOR ORIENTIS	[Cyz, An] Manns (1939), 37 (RIC -).
	[Sis/Ser(?), AV] Rohde 34-6 (Manns (1939), 56).

3. (Sol as 2, at feet a captive)

3a. SOLI INVICTO	[Sis, An] RIC 257 (Mara. 504; Sirm. 1072).
	[Sis, An] RIC 257 (Sirm. 1074).
	[Trp, An] RIC 390 (Syria C 323-9).
	[Trp, An] RIC 390 (Syria C 330-43; 364).
3b. SOLI INVICTO.	[Trp, An] RIC 390 (Syria A 19; Syria B 33; Syria C 356-61; cf. Sirm. 1820).
3c. PMTRPVICOSIIPP	[Sis, AV] RIC 185 (cf. Manns (1939), 54, cites as "PM TRP VII COS II PP").
3d. CONSERVAT AVG	[Ant, AV] RIC 371-3 (Manns (1939), 49)
	[Ant, An] RIC 384 (Syria A 6; Syria C 91-2, 94-7, 101-6, 111-13, 116).
	[Ant, An] RIC 385 (Manns (1939), 52).
3e. CONSERV(AT) AVG	[Ant, An] RIC 383 (Syria C 149-50; captive prostrate beneath Sol's feet).

4. (Sol as 2, at feet a captive on either side)

4a. SOLI INVICTO	[Tic, An] Sirm. 410 (cf. RIC 154).
	[Tic, An] RIC 154 (Mara. 360-1, 364; 369-71; Sirm. 415-23);
	[Ser, An] RIC 307.
	[Ser, An] 308 (Mara. 572; Sirm. 1501-4).

5. (Sol, radiate with cloak, whip + globe, in a quadriga to l.)

5a. SOLI INVICTO	[Ser(?), AEm(Absch)] Gnecchi II, 113, no.2 (Manns (1939), 44; Rohde 435; cf. RIC 77).

6. (As 5, but quadriga frontal, horses spread 2 r./2 l.)

6a. SOLI INVICTO	[Ser(?), AEm(Absch)] Gnecchi II, 113, no.3 (Manns (1939), 44; Rohde 434; RIC 78).

[Continued over...

TABLE A:16 (cont.)

Aurelian and Sol II:
Sol as Aurelian's principal tutelary deity
(Entries 7-12: Solar Investiture)

7 (Emp. receiving globe from Sol, holding whip in l.h.)

7a. SOLI CONSERVATORI	[Cyz, An]	RIC 353 (Rohde 350).
7b. RESTITVTOR ORBIS	[Cyz, An]	Sirm. 1797-1800 (cf. RIC 367).
7c. ORIENS AVG	[Ser, An]	RIC 282.
	[Ser, An]	RIC 283.

8. (As 7, except Mars in place of emp.) (*)

8a. MARS INVICTVS	[Cyz, An]	RIC 357 (Sirm. 1769; Rohde 213).

9. (Emp. and Sol, as 7, but between them a captive; cf. 3)

9a. SOLI INVICTO	[Ser, An]	RIC 312-15 (Rohde 362-5)
9b. VIRTVS AVG	[Ser, An]	RIC 316-17 (Rohde 394).
9c. RESTITVTOR ORBIS	[Cyz, An]	RIC 367 (cf. Rohde 334-6).

10. (As 9, except Mars in place of emp.)

10a. MARS INVICTVS	[Cyz, An]	RIC 358 (Sirm. 1770; Rohde 214).
10b. MARTI INVICTO	[Cyz, An]	RIC 359 (Rohde 216).

11. (Similar to 9, but Hercules in place of emp.)

11a. VIRTVS AVG	[Ser, An]	RIC 318 (Manns (1939), 56).

12. (As 7, two captives in exergue)

12a. SOLI CONSERVATORI	[Cyz, An]	RIC 353 (Manns (1939), 41; Rohde 349).

(*) NOTE: Compare this MARS INVICTVS type with the contemporary RESTITVTOR EXERCITI (Mars hands globe to emp.) [Cyz, An] RIC 366 (Maravelle 673-5; Sirmium 1810-15; cf. Rohde 215)

NOTE TO REFERENCES: Mara. = Maravelle; Sirm. = Sirmium.

NOTES

NOTES: Chapter 1

"Approaching the Political History of the Mid-third Century"

1. Gibbon (1909-14), I, xii, 341; Hobbes, Leviathan, ch.13 (Penguin ed., p.186).

2. The situation is confused by the conflicting literary accounts and by the fictions of the HA (see Herrmann (1965), 79-82). The occasional inclusion of individuals (such as Odenathus) who did not actually claim Roman imperial authority as such is a further complication. See, however, the list in Hartmann (1982), 63-5 (which also includes the three Caesars, Maximus, Valerian Junior and Tetricus Junior). The only one definitely to end his reign without violence was Claudius II (who succumbed to plague in 270, after a reign of only two years); the case of Carus is questionable (lightning or foul play, both versions are given; the latter is more believable).

3. Though many different dates have been suggested at one time or another for this vital event, upon which so much of the chronology of this period depends, there can no longer be any serious doubt that the capture of Valerian by the Sassanians took place in the late summer of 260, most likely in the first week or so of September. See now Rathbone (1986), 117-18; Bland (1988b), 259, calling for an end to the debate; Konig (1981), 4-16; Drinkwater (1987), 95-9 (this represents a conversion from his previous thinking: cf. Drinkwater (1973), 66ff. and Drinkwater (1974); note his remarks in Drinkwater (1983), esp. 469). In general (for those emperors recognized in Egypt) I have relied upon the chronological framework supplied in the detailed study by Rathbone (1986).

4. The relevant books of Ammianus, which might have been our best hope, are missing and Enmann's Kaisergeschichte has been so entirely lost that its very existence depends upon inference. On these Latin sources, including the KG, see R. Browning (1983), on "Biography" and "History" in E.J. Kenney (ed.), Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II.5 The

Later Principate, [pbk.] Cambridge, 1983, 50-72, esp. 54ff. The extensiveness of the Quellenforschung with regard to the HA alone prohibits any attempt to list the bibliography: however, note esp. Syme (1968) and (1971). On Dexippus, see Millar (1969).

5. Some of these difficulties will be dealt with in detail below in Ch.2.

6. The gloom of this period of frequent usurpations is still being dismissed as impenetrable today: e.g. MacMullen (1988), 111. For the simile of the "dark tunnel", Jones (1964), 23.

7. Schulz (1919), 170-71; 266ff.; based on Victor Caes. 37.5 (but cf. on Maximinus below). This demarcation is to be found also in Wickert (1954), 2290ff.; Herrmann (1965), 75; Hartke (1951), 171ff.; cf. (suggesting Aurelian as the moment of caesura) Mattingly (1939), 298; Storch (1972), 203; Stertz (1974), 63ff.; cf. Hannestad (1986), 285-9 (Maximinus, see Eutrop., 9.1; Victor Caes. 25).

8. Jones (1964), 23.

9. Bleicken (1981), II, 77ff., suggests that the soldateska who seized power in the mid-third century are not worthy to be considered as "emperors" at all. Although he thereby removes some of the awkward anomalies of the conventional dichotomy, he still implicitly acknowledges its theoretical validity. It is worth noting that in its sweeping denouncement of the period Bleicken's approach amounts to little more than a restatement of Rostovtzeff's "Anarchy" (with which he elsewhere takes issue).

10. Lopuszanski (1951), 30.

11. The news of Valerian's ignominious capture must have reached the western provinces in the autumn of 260, giving us a terminus post quem for the revolt of Postumus, which certainly took place before (probably considerably before) 10 December 260 (cf. references cited in n.3 above).

12. For the chronology of the reigns of Postumus and his successors in the western provinces I have largely followed König (1981), amended where necessary by the findings of more recent works such as those of Schulte (1983) and Drinkwater (1987), esp. 94-8. In outline it is as follows: Laelian revolted in the early spring of 269, apparently at Mainz, but was quickly suppressed; Postumus was promptly lynched by his own

troops, having prohibited them from looting Mainz. Marius (spring 269) was also murdered only a few weeks later; he was followed by Victorinus (late spring 269). When he too was assassinated, the soldiers chose Tetricus, the governor of Aquitania, who was apparently still in Bordeaux at the time (spring 271). Sometime in 273 Tetricus elevated his young son of the same name to be his Caesar, holding a joint consulship with the boy the following January; it was perhaps the early summer of 274 when Aurelian defeated and captured the Tetrici at Châlons.

13. There was little appreciable delay between the capture of Valerian and the revolt of Macrianus and Quietus; they continued to be recognized in the eastern provinces, including Egypt, until the winter of 261/2 when Odenathus defeated and killed Quietus, Macrianus having already suffered a similar fate the previous summer in the Balkans at the hands of Gallienus' generals Domitianus and Aureolus (Zon. 12.24; Cont. Dion. fr. 159 (ed. Boissevain, III, 742); SHA Tyr. trig. 12-14, (passim); 15.4; Gall. 1.2-3.5). For dates, see Rathbone (1986), 118-19; and for coinage, Mattingly (1954); cf. Besly & Bland (1983), 40-41.

14. The suggestions: "die gallischen Usurpatoren", König (1981); "Romano-Gallic empire" (with short discussion of the problem), Bland (1988b), 258; cf. the French "les empereurs gallo-romains": e.g. Hiernard (1952); Pflaum (1957).

15. Even to grant these events the term "episode" could be prejudicial, so that I must emphasize that where I do use this term, I refer only to the duration of the division of political loyalties in the western provinces, and not to the implicit existence of a consciously separate political entity. For a full discussion of this question, see chapter 5.b, below.

16. See thus Herodian II.8.6 (on Pescennius Niger); the usurpations of the third century clearly conformed more or less to this pattern.

17. The advertisement of status in this way formed part of the ancient philotimia. For emperors, the scale and the attention to detail involved in the creation, distribution and erection of such representations underlines the importance attached to the link between these symbols of imperial authority and the individual, as equally does the severance of this link (by defacing, sometimes in the literal sense) in cases of damnatio memoriae. On the significance of imperial

images in the socio-political structure of the empire, see Price, S. (1984), 170-206; Hopkins (1978), 225-6; cf. Tacitus Hist. 1.41; Plutarch Galba 26.

18. For a new emperor in particular, the issue of coinage in his own name was thus a pressing concern, as soon as he had access to a mint; not least because it served the second function of providing the wherewithal to remunerate the troops who had supported his claim.

19. The design of the coinage, incorporating the verbal and iconographic symbols of imperial authority (supplemented occasionally by subsequent marks of revalidation, or "countermarks") was precisely what distinguished a "coin" from some other object and rendered it acceptable as "currency". Due to the role of public recognition, the scope for variation in coin design was somewhat restricted; none the less the variety in fact employed vastly exceeds that of modern currency. On the relationship of design and function in Roman coinage, see Grierson (1975), 72ff.; Casey (1986), 11ff., cf. 24f.; Wallace-Hadrill (1986), esp. 67, 70, 84.

20. Matthew, 22.20-21 (cf. Mark 12.17; Luke 20.24). Similarly, Suetonius' story (Tib 58) that in the worst years of Tiberius' reign a man could be accused of lèse-majesté merely for taking a coin bearing the portrait of Augustus into a brothel or a latrine illustrates that both he and his readers appreciated the intimate connection between "majesty" and "image". The fact of issuing coinage was thus clearly of great symbolic significance. On this matter, see further Ch.2.a, below.

21. For dubious assertions of this kind, see SHA Tyr. trig. 26.2; 31.3; Firm. 2.1. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill (1986), 69.

22. I shall return to the relevance of symbolic representations of all kinds for our understanding of political authority in more detail below, Ch.6.c.

23. For example, Price, S. (1980), (1984) and (1987); Zanker (1988); and cf. P. Zanker "Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin", in Città e Architettura nella Roma Imperiale (1983). Note also particularly, in this regard, Millar & Segal (1984); Wallace-Hadrill (1986).

24. For example: MacCormack (1972) and (1981); Cameron, A (1976); McCormick (1986); Cameron A.M. (1987).

NOTES: Chapter 1

25. There are exceptions, such as the fragment of Dexippus describing the embassy of the Juthungi to Aurelian (F.Gr.H. (Jacoby), 100, F.6; cf. Millar (1969), 25); but on the whole the literary evidence is not of much use, due largely to the intrusion of anachronisms. On the various available sources for this period which are of use in this present context and my reasons for concentrating on certain of them over others, see below, chapter 2.a.

26. A full list of those covered, together with the abbreviations used for them in this work, is given on p.263, below.

NOTES: Chapter 2

"Evaluating the Numismatic and Epigraphic Material"

1. The term "non-literary" still implies texts, such as the legal codes, of which there is insufficient for this period to be of any significant help here; I have therefore avoided the term.

2. Certain types of public architecture (imperial civic buildings including baths, fora, circuses, theatres, temples, altars, mausolea and triumphal arches) would also, as indicated in the previous chapter, be germane. The scarcity of extant imperial art and architecture of this kind for the reigns we are concerned with is too great to allow this evidence to be much use. For the western emperors there is nothing at all; for Aurelian next to nothing: the bust in the Istanbul Museum wearing a corona civica (inv. no. 4864; Andreae (1977), fig. 133), has only tentatively been identified as Aurelian and only in some quarters; see Wegner (1979), 142 (cf. 141-3, for all the possible Aurelianic portraits, noting that none are secure). For Valerian and especially Gallienus, there is far more in the way of portrait sculpture, but still not enough to merit automatic inclusion: Wood (1986; cf., however, the review by R.R.R. Smith JRS 78 (1988), 257-8); Wegner (1979), 101-34.

3. The collapse within a comparatively short period (most noticeably in the two decades from 257 to 276) of the local civic coinages of the cities of the eastern Mediterranean necessarily entailed the monopoly of imperial coinage in those sectors of the economy which continued to be at least partially currency-based: see Howgego (1985), 65-73. The timing of this event is not fortuitous, coinciding precisely with the most rapid increase in the number of imperial mints and the sharpest debasement of the imperial coinage. On local civic coinage, see Howgego (1985); Harl (1987), esp. 91-4; Butcher (1988).

4. Göbl (1978), 30; Toynbee (1944), 27ff.; cf. also Grant in Int. Num. Congr. (1957), 157, 167ff.

5. See Peachin (1990), 14-19. See also the contribution on epigraphy by Fergus Millar in Crawford (1983b), 80-136. For modern works on epigraphy used extensively here, see below n.14.

6. See Peachin (1990), 20. For the potential of the papyrological evidence for chronology, see Rathbone (1986). It has no direct bearing on the western emperors. It need hardly be added that Egypt is something of a case apart in a study of this kind, so that generalizations from the evidence provided by this evidence is impermissible. For modern works used extensively, see below n.14.

7. Webb's RIC V, that is Webb (1927) and (1933), regrettably remains a necessary reference point. My grateful thanks to Dr. Cathy King for making the manuscript of her work available to me. Cohen's catalogue (Cohen (1885-8), based largely on the Paris collection) still remains a useful tool for checking Webb, who relied extensively upon it.

8. The plans to bring BMC down to the middle of the third century AD are only in the initial stages. Robertson (1978), though helpful, is neither sufficiently comprehensive (due to the size of the collection) nor sufficiently reliable to be entirely dependable. On "medallions", Gnecchi (1912); Toynbee (1944).

9. Göbl (1951) and (1953); part of the "Aufbau" series in NZ, begun by Pink in 1930s (see Göbl (1951), 10, sv. Pink), with which they maintain a certain correspondence, including an elaborate codification of obverse types peculiar to themselves. There is, however, very little attempt to give cross references to other works (for example those of Webb or Cohen), which diminishes their usefulness.

10. The reverse iconographs supplied by Göbl are numbered differently in in the two monographs (Göbl (1951), 45; Göbl (1953), 35) and the numbers in the text of the second are actually different again (cf. the concordance Göbl (1953), 34); the author himself falls foul of this complexity on several occasions. The ideographs do have their benefits, however, not the least of which is the errors caused by wrongful or misleading verbal descriptions (see below, Ch.4.b). For an earlier, and occasionally still useful attempt at cataloguing the coinage of Valerian and Gallienus, see Voetter (1901-2).

11. Alföldi, A. (1937) and (1938) on the eastern coinage, Alföldi, A. (1931) on Siscia, in the reign of Gallienus. The latter has been updated, with slight modifications and an important concordance, by Fitz (1981-2). Several other contributions by Alföldi on the coinage of this period have also helped to clarify the subject (Bibliography, s.v.).

12. Manns (1939); Rohde (1881). Manns' work suffers greatly from a complete lack of illustrations coupled with rather poor reverse iconography descriptions. However, allowing for these drawbacks, and the comparative rarity of the work itself, it remains a useful control for sorting out the problems in Webb's assessment of the coinage of the reign in RIC.

13. Elmer (1941); de Witte (1868). For the contributions of Lafaurie, notably Lafaurie (1975) and Bastien, notably the catalogue of Postumus' bronze output, Bastien (1967), see the bibliography; also Schulte (1983), and the various works by Gilljam and Drinkwater (bibliography, s.v.). The study of this coinage has benefited particularly from the analysis of hoards in recent decades: e.g. Lallemand & Thirion (1970); see below, n.32.

14. Peachin (1990). The deficiencies of his handling of the evidence from Roman imperial coinage, principally consisting of a wayward system of cataloguing without due regard for the difference between obverse and reverse and a serious lack of discrimination stemming from an almost exclusive reliance on RIC and Hunter, appear to arise largely from a lack of proper acquaintance with the subject. This stands in marked contrast to his efficient and evidently experienced handling of the epigraphic evidence. It is also to be regretted, though understandable given the scope of the work, that Peachin ignores the imperial women completely. On the other works concerned with the epigraphic and papyrological evidence mentioned here: Homo (1904); Sotgiu (1961), cf. also Sotgiu (1975);

König (1981); Bureth (1964); Sijpesteijn (1980), (1982a), (1982b).

15. The conscious sophistication of twentieth century propaganda, together with the taint of totalitarianism (especially fascism) that the term has acquired, make its use misleading in this context (see below, Ch.6.c). On the use of the term "propaganda" in this context, see Wallace-Hadrill (1986), 67, esp. n.4 and the works cited therein.

16. See, for example, Charlesworth (1937); Grant (1946), (1950); Mattingly (1960), 139ff. [first publ. 1928]; Sutherland (1951); Wickert (1954), 2226-52.

17. Jones (1956); supported, most emphatically, by Crawford (1983a); cf. the perfunctory remarks on types and legends by the same author in Crawford (1983b), 228-30.

18. Notably, Sutherland (1959), (1976), (1983), (1986), (1987). Mattters of policy have often been "deduced" from coinage: e.g. Grant (1958); Amit (1965), 53ff.; de Blois (1976), esp. 121; Kuhoff (1979), esp. 52ff.; Hannestad (1986). The grounds for such assertions are often flimsy (but where in de Blois it is an excess, and in Kuhoff an indulgence, in Hannestad it becomes a vice: cf. my review in JRS 79 (1989), 217-18). A due note of caution was sounded (with reference to Drinkwater (1987) in particular) by Bland (1988b), 259.

19. The bibliography on this debate is now substantial, too much so to list here. Besides the works already mentioned, note especially Buttrey (1972); Belloni (1974); Grierson (1975); Levick (1982); Wallace-Hadrill (1981); Wallace-Hadrill (1986). The last provides an intelligent and unpolemical assessment of where the matter now stands.

20. The description of the emperor at work offered in Millar (1977) seems to me to refute the argument of the sceptics that the emperor could not possibly have been bothered with such minor details. This is not to say that he necessarily did, however. On our lack of knowledge of mint operations and logistics, see Millar (1981), 70f., 241-2.

21. The most extreme and most untenable use of this terminology is provided by Storch (1972), 200ff. (esp. p.203). For Storch, inscriptions too are "semi-official"; his ideas are an adaptation of those of Imhoff (1957), 110, based on the emperor's volition. How the emperor's intentions are to be

assessed is a question never properly addressed. Berlinger (1935), while treating the "unofficial" with greater respect, draws the distinction none the less. Crawford (1983a), 59, also draws an unequivocal contrast between the "meaning" of the two sides of the coin; this has been amply refuted by Wallace-Hadrill (1986), esp. 69.

22. See, notably, Levick (1982), esp. 107; cf. Sutherland (1986), passim; Wallace-Hadrill (1986), 67-8. In this respect, the parity mentioned in the previous note between the symbolism on (the reverse side of) the coins and that on the inscriptions (where in most cases we are dealing with an inscription to, rather than a "message" from, the emperor) is revealing.

23. The debased metal used for the bulk of the output of "silver" coinage of this period has rendered it more susceptible to corrosion, so that they are frequently found in very poor condition and consequently difficult to decifer. For the depths of the debasement under Gallienus, see King, C. (1982), 470-72; cf. more generally, the works cited in n.34 below. On one issue of denarii this period see, e.g. Bastien & Pflaum (1962), 277-81. Some silver alloy medallions are also attested at this time, but they are not common (see Gnecchi (1912), I). On Aurelian's reform: Carson (1965); Estiot (1983), 38; cf. the confused and confusing account in Jones (1974), 196, esp. n.24.

24. Göbl (1951), 39-44 (esp. the chart, p.44), plots the movements of the two Augusti between 253 and 260 on the basis of his reconstruction of the gold issues rather than the other way round. Where there is rather more secure evidence of imperial movements, in the sole reign of Gallienus, the conjecture works rather less convincingly. This assumption regarding gold issues and the emperor's presence is also used (again with no real evidence) by Schulte (1983), 19, Drinkwater (1987), 157; cf. its reputed application to the fourth century by Bruun in RIC VII (1966), p.13ff; However, it is (surely rightly) rejected by others: see Bland (1988b), 259. On the comparative rarity, small circulation and variations in weight and size of the gold issues of the period, see Jones (1974), 196-7; Göbl (1951), 17; cf. the catalogue in Schulte (1983).

25. On the treatment of Abschläge in this period see Bland (1988b), 260; Besley (1984), 230-31; cf. the somewhat personal treatment in Shculte (1983). See also Göbl (1978), 32. For a detailed study of bronze

coinage in this period, see the monograph on Postumus' bronze output, Bastien (1967).

26. For the conventional tale of woe, see Mattingly (1960), 125, 186; Callu (1969), 289-323. The evidence for inflation in the mid-third century is surprisingly conjectural, arguing back from the early fourth century: see, e.g., Jones (1974), 226-7. There is no reason to suppose steady inflation however: in fact, it is distinctly possible (as suggested to me by Andrew Burnett) that the inflation of the Tetrarchic period leading up to the Price Edict was considerably worse, and consequently that of our period proportionally less, than is usually assumed. Crawford (1975), lends some support to this thesis. Drinkwater (1987), 211, 235, also argues against the idea of economic collapse in the western provinces until late in the century.

27. The quality of the metal and of the workmanship of the "barbarous" coins is inferior, making them particularly difficult to arrange. On the distinction "counterfeits"/"forgeries", see Grierson (1975), 158-61; cf. Carson (1990), 286-91; Göbl (1978), I 190 (Fälschmünzerei/Münzfälscherei). On hybrids and mules, see Bland & Burnett (1988), 119.

28. In fact the gold types for these two emperors represent among the finest examples of die-cutting in the history of Roman coinage. For example, the exquisitely worked (and exceptionally heavy, at 7.4 gms.) aureus of Postumus, E.538 (S.138); cf. the GALLIENAE AVGVSTAE series, Ch.3, n.89.

29. The multiplication and relocation of imperial mints during this period makes the task of arranging the coinage particularly difficult and at times rather subjective. See Drinkwater (1987), 134-5, esp. nn.10-17. For the location and arrangement of mints during the reigns with which we are primarily concerned, see below, 2.c-2.d.

30. The subjective element is not to deny either the skill or the accuracy of the analyses; see Bland (1988b), 259. Obverse legends can only be a guide: Göbl's arrangement of Gallienus' Roman mint output is a case in point (see below, n.59).

31. For an example of unnecessary over-sophistication in the sequence of coin-issues at a given mint, see the arrangement of the material from Gallienus' mint at Siscia by Göbl (1953), 23ff. (cf. Bland & Burnett (1988), 125).

32. The hoards that have contributed to the study of this period are too numerous to mention here. In particular: Cunetio in Besly & Bland (1983); Normanby in Bland & Burnett (1988), 114-215; Sirmium in Kellner (1978); Maravelille in Estiot (1983); cf. the list of abbreviations, p.264. For the use of hoards as evidence, see Crawford (1970), 40-48; Crawford (1983b), 185ff.; Drinkwater (1974).

33. On the advantages of die studies, Grierson (1975), 155-7. The particular works mentioned: Schulte (1983); Shiel (1979), Gilljam (1987); Gilljam (1982), Gilljam (1986), respectively.

34. On these techniques and their applications, see Grierson (1975), 147-54; Casey (1986), 128-43. There is still some doubt as to the validity of results thus obtained; undoubtedly counterfeits and malpractice in the mints distort the picture. Recent work has shown that the variations in weight (in all metals) and in metal content (particularly in the antoninianus) were surprisingly great even among coinage that are generally considered to be from a single issue. See, for example, on the issues of Gallienus' sole reign from Rome, King, C. (1982), passim (esp. the figures and talbes pp.477-85); Bland & Burnett (1988), 119-20 (including table 5). Further on the debasement of the antoninianus in this period see: Le Gentilhomme (1962), 152-5; Cope (1974); Tyler (1975), Appendix 2; Cope (1977); Walker (1978), esp. 136ff.

35. These difficulties have led to many erroneous datings: see Price, M. (1973), 84; Drinkwater (1987), 123. Several examples of applying the numeral to the wrong title (because it refers forward rather than back) can be found in the catalogue of Peachin (1990). On the importance of the consulship and its enumeration in this period, see below Ch.3.a.

36. For the suggestion that these emperors rejected the 10 December date for their tribunician years: for Aurelian, Kramer & Jones (1943), esp. 83-6; Bivona (1966), 106-21; Pond (1970), 110-13; for Gallienus, Göbl (1953), 8-9; for Gallienus and Valerian, Armstrong (1987). There are severe discrepancies on any count, however, and on the whole it is better to assume that these emperors stayed with the traditional date: so, Sotgiu (1961), 11-16; Sotgiu (1975), 1044; Rea (1972), 28; Peachin (1990), 51-2; 77-9; 88-91. The problems are compounded in the case of the western emperors by the absence of fasti.

37. The best evidence for the dates of Aurelian's reign come from Egypt, but it is also self-contradictory.

However recent research has removed most of the main difficulties. On the dating of Aurelian's usurpation, the elimination of Quintillus and the change in Aurelian's regnal years, see now Rathbone (1986), 120-5; Price, M (1973), 77-85; cf. also Rea (1972), 15-30; Groag (1903), 1355; Homo (1904), 40. Quintillus was able to mint coins at both Siscia and Cyzicus, so that if Aurelian was proclaimed at Sirmium (Zonaras 12.26) before news of Claudius' death could have reached Rome, he was not acknowledged outside Pannonia Inferior for some time. By late September Quintillus was almost certainly dead, though the consular dating used in the papyri of this time might betoken confusion caused by the imminent invasion by Palmyra. It is important to note that when Egypt began to recognize Aurelian once more (June 272) it was initially the old dating that was used by the mint at Alexandria: Milne 4354-7 (not noted by Rathbone).

38. The conventional arrangement was set out in two articles by Alföldi: Alföldi, A. (1937) and (1938). This arrangement was essentially followed by Göbl (1951), 35ff., and (1953), 27ff.; later refined by others, notably: Carson (1968); Elks (1975); Besly & Bland (1983), 40f.

39. The existence of two separate mints at work for Gallienus in series (d), suggested by Besly & Bland (1983), 41 (their "third eastern mint", see next note), is on the whole unlikely; if a separate mint is to be contemplated, its precise location is unknown. Besly & Bland (1983), 40f., placed (d) before (e): this is supported by the obverse and reverse typology and by the use of the wreath mark in the field (absent from the Macrianic coinage). If so, (d) must have been rushed out to meet the emergency presented by the capture of Valerian, perhaps even by the Macriani themselves before their control of the area had turned to open revolt (a suggestion made to me personally by Dr. Cathy King). However, it is difficult to fit (d) into the short timespan between the capture of Valerian and the usurpation of the Macriani, whereas it fits easily into the otherwise longish gap between the defeat of Quietus and the start of (f). The (d)-(f) mule, Normanby 578, would seem to indicate the latter is more likely. If so, it represents a return to the old style in the wake of the suppression of that revolt, some time before the recognizably sole-reign style (f) was introduced. Roger Bland has since (personal communication) expressed reservations on both the points as outlined in Besly & Bland (1983).

40. In his paper on the coinage of Macrianus and Quietus Mattingly (1954) discerned sufficient differences to postulate a second mint. It was this observation which drew Besly & Bland (1983), 41, to conclude the existence of this separate operation under Gallienus: it is now thought more likely to be simply the work of a particular workshop, or even a particular die-cutter (see previous note).

41. That Antioch was the location of the sole reign eastern mint is clearly shown by the continuity through to Claudius and beyond (see below, n.81); Alföldi, A. (1938), 48ff.; Göbl (1953) 27ff.; Elks (1975), 99ff.

42. The revised arrangement, which will essentially be that employed by the new edition of RIC, currently in preparation, was communicated to me personally by Roger Bland, to whom I am especially grateful for all his help, not least concerning the eastern mints. (He also observed the existence of a die link (b)-(c), which might cast doubt on the existence of a truly separate second mint at all; for the time being I have decided to leave matters as they stood prior to this observation.)

43. The Cyzicene officina marking (dots on the obverse) are found in conjunction with with the SPQR reverse mark in the reign of Claudius and close stylistic connections have also been observed between the SPQR coins and the city's local civic bronzes at this date (Roger Bland, personal communication). For Ephesus (and noting affinities with Siscia), Alföldi, A. (1938), 59ff.; Göbl (1953), 30. For other suggestions, Carson (1968); Elks (1975), esp. p.108.

44. This point is demonstrated by the stylistic continuity from Gallienus to Postumus, especially noticeable between certain of Gallienus' VICT GERMANICA and Postumus' early VICTORIA AVG (E.118) types: see Besly & Bland (1983), 44.

45. Elmer (1941), 30, argued convincingly for Cologne as the site of Gallienus' (and thus Postumus' principal) Gallic mint, based partly on the strength of epigraphic and literary references linking that city and the Licinian house, citing CIL XIII 8261 (a prominent inscription above the north gate of the city); Zosimos, I.38; Zonaras, 12:24.10-12 (on Cologne as the site of Saloninus' last stand; but cf. below note 62). In addition, certain late coins of Postumus (E.570-71, 584-85) specifically mention Cologne. This idea was generally accepted (see, e.g., Göbl (1951), 30).

46. For the existence of a mint operation at Trier in the mid-third century: CIL VI 1641; XIII, 1131. For Trier as the subsidiary mint for the later western emperors: Elmer (1941), 14 (cf. 56, 58, 74). This arrangement followed by Lafaurie (1975) and others; Lallemand & Thirion (1970), 21, and König (1981), 145ff., delay the final settlement of the subsidiary mint in Trier to the reign of Victorinus.

47. Trier as the principal mint, Cologne as subsidiary: Besly & Bland (1983), 44-65, esp. 53-8; followed by Drinkwater (1987), 143 (cf. 135-47 generally); restated by Bland & Burnett (1988), 147ff. (esp. 147 and n.135). Besly & Bland (1983), 51f., 55-7, also suggested that Postumus' Moneta type E.336 (cf. the later E.584-5 which heralded the new Cologne mint) together with E.593 (redated; cf. Carson (1968), 68, supported by Bland (1982), 96 n.160), which do not fit into the normal series at his principal mint, may represent the work of a moneta comitatensis, which may later (in 268) have been consolidated into a permanent mint at Cologne. The matter was left open by Drinkwater (1987), 143, and Bland & Burnett (1988), 161 n.128.

48. Elmer's dating demands that Postumus indulge in an impossibly lengthy siege of Cologne before he could get at the mint inside in order to start issuing coins to pay his mutinous troops. The explanations of both Elmer (1941), 17, 27, and Carson (1957), 270ff. are unconvincing: see Drinkwater (1987), 98. Moreover, the misspelling (POSTIMVS) and poor likeness on the obverses of Postumus' earliest coinage would be better accounted for by assuming that they were minted at some distance from Postumus at Cologne, besieging Saloninus. It is far better to assume that Postumus took possession of Trier, and with it the bulk of Gallienus' mint, some time before Cologne finally capitulated. On this see Besly & Bland (1983), 44, 57-8. The coins: [An] Cunetio 2367-8 (cf. E.117); Cunetio 2369-70 (cf. E.118); [AV] Baval, pl. 1, 30 (cf. Besly (1984), 232; Bland (1988b), 260).

49. There is stylistic continuity between Postumus' Cologne-coinage and the coinage of Laelian: Besly & Bland (1983), 57; Besly (1984), 229; Bland & Burnett (1988), 147, 162 n.130. There is also continuity between the other last issues of Postumus (E.591, E.597, E.599; which were minted for longer: in the Cunetio hoard they outnumbered the last Cologne-style coinage, E.595-6, by 12:1: Besly (1984), 230 n.14) and the coins of Marius' principal mint. Finally, as many as half the reverse dies of Laelian's antoniniani were reused for Marius at the latter's second mint, even

though Postumus gained control of Laelian's stronghold: Gilljam (1986); see also Besly (1984), 229; Bland & Burnett (1988), 147. The style clearly continues also, including the gold: E.642 (= [M] S.6) is clearly from the second mint (pace Schulte: Besly (1984), 229, following Elmer, Lafaurie (1975) and Gilljam (1981), 39f.); cf. Besly & Bland (1983), 57.

50. Webb (1927), 1, 19, cf. (1933), 328ff., following Voetter (1900/1901). This was decisively rejected by Elmer (1941), 8ff.; and rightly so, pace Carson (1990), 110-15, who places the mint of the western emperors at Lyon. Transfer to Lyon under the later western emperors: Besly & Bland (1983), 58, 64; but cf. Drinkwater (1987), 144. The transfer under the later western emperors is doubly unlikely in view of the Aeduan revolt.

51. In fact Tetricus probably concentrated all his mint operation at Trier towards the end of his reign; the die cutting may all have been centralized here some time earlier. On this and the hybrids, see Bland & Burnett (1988), 148-55 (esp. 153-5); also Drinkwater (1987), 144, 146. On Aurelian, see n.72 below.

52. Sirmium suggested by Alföldi, A. (1931), 9-11; followed by Göbl (1953), 27. Doubts were expressed by Besly & Bland (1983), 31, cf. p.27 fig. 2, p.29 Table 12. A more radical solution was proposed by Bland & Burnett (1988), 121-3: arranged in two series (the first with SP for Gallienus and RP for his consort; the second with PII for both) minted at a seventh (?) officina at Rome, the workmen of which perhaps went on to set up Siscia as late as AD 265 (cf. below, 2.d, and nn. 59 and 65).

53. Mint workers' revolt at Rome: SHA Aur. 38.2; Victor Caes. 35.6; Epit. 35.2; Eutrop. 9.14; Homo (1904), 162-4; Groag (1903), 1372-7. (Although it was a serious revolt, the figures for the military might involved given in the sources are clearly exaggerations.) The revolt must precede reopening of the Roman mint in the summer of 273, since minting thereafter is regular: Estiot (1983), 33-7 (esp. 33, n.70). But Aurelian's monetary reform (see Zos. I.61.3) must have been in the spring of 274: Estiot (1983), 15 (cf. 37-9); Bolin (1958), 291-2; cf. Carson (1965), 233-5. Peachin (1983), argues for Antioch instead of Rome; refuted by Bland & Burnett (1988), 146.

54. The revolt in 271: SHA Aur. 21.5-6; Zos. I.49.2; cf. Amm. 30.8.8. (The Domitianus mentioned by Zosimus may be Gallienus' general of that name (see above, chapter

1, n.13) and may also be identical to that given on the single coin, of apparently Gallic origin but dubious authenticity, in Webb (1933), 590; see PLRE I, 262 "Domitianus" 1; Peachin (1990), 45, 406). Very likely this revolt and that of the mint workers were connected. After the moneyers' revolt was quelled, the mint at Rome was shut down (some of the personnel apparently being transfered to open the new mint at Serdica) and was not reopened for two years: see Estiot (1983), 33.

55. On date and purpose of the DIVO CLAVDIO issues, see now Bland & Burnett (1988), 144-6, setting it firmly in the first twelve months of Aurelian's reign as part of his efforts to nullify the reign of Quintillus (cf. above at n.37). See also A. Alföldi, "Siscia II: Die Prägungen von Claudius II und Quintillus", NK 34-5 (1935-6), 14, 68; and more tentatively, Carson (1990), 108f. For the issues generally, see Bland & Burnett (1988), 138-46, esp. 140-2 (Table 19; note esp. no.94: a Cyzicene coin of Aurelian overstruck with the consecration dies). On connection with the moneyers' revolt (fear of retribution for mint malpractice), see Bernareggi (1974); Bland & Burnett (1988), 146.

56. Zos. I.62; Zon. 12.27; Eutrop. 9.15.2; SHA Aur. 35.5-36.6; Lact. 6.2; Victor Caes. 35.8 (stressing Aurelian's strictness as the motivation).

57. The exact date of Aurelian's murder and the length of the "interregnum" are uncertain, though the latter was apparently at least some weeks: SHA Aur. 40.2-4; Tac. 2; Victor Caes. 35.9-36.1; cf. Epit. 35.1. On the problematic dating, see Syme (1971), 237f.; Chastagnol (1980), 76f.; Rathbone (1986), 124f.; Peachin (1990), 44.

58. See e.g. Webb (1933), 253; Mattingly (1939), 310. In addition to the usual CONCORDIAE MILITVM types for Severina, Kellner (1978), 31, n.1205 and 35, n.1536, suggested that Aurelian's PROVIDEN DEOR type might have been issued posthumously under the auspices of Severina. Estiot (1983), 23, rejects the very idea of "interregnum" issues as there does not appear to be a separate issue for Severina at Siscia (but the post-reform issues at Sis. are notoriously tricky: cf. Estiot (1983), 25; Kellner (1978), 30-1). Since the evidence is highly speculative (esp. at Sis., Cyz. and Ant.), the whole qustion is best left open. See App., table A:1. On the reputed "interregnum" coinage with GENIVS P R, see below, Ch.3.c, n.94.

59. Recent studies, especially in metrology and metal-analysis, have produced results which appear to

confound the simplicity of the arrangement supplied in Göbl (1951), 19-27 and Göbl (1953), 12-18. Precisely what revision is needed remains open to question. For the joint reign, cf. Lallemand (1972); Besly & Bland (1983), 22-5. For the sole reign see King, C. (1982); Besly & Bland (1983), 25-9; Bland & Burnett (1988), 119-21; cf. also Carson (1961), 216f.; Tyler (1975), esp. pp.33-6; Cope (1974), 126-8. On the increase(s) in officinae Göbl (1953, 15-17); revised by Dolley & O'Donovan (1962), esp. p.166; cf. King, C. (1982), 469, n.3; Bastien & Pflaum (1961), 83. See now, however, the complications mentioned above, 2.c n.52.

60. On Viminacium see Fitz (1978), 665-80; Göbl (1951), 27-30 (each assigning six issues); Besly & Bland (1983), 31f. (assigning only three issues; cf. their Table 16). For the idea that a rump mint remained with Valerian II on the Danube, being closed only on his death, see Fitz (1966a); <u>contra</u>: Elmer (1941), 9ff; Göbl (1970); Drinkwater (1987), 100-102. On the location of this mint, see also Le Gentilhomme (1946), 65-6, cf.70 (Aquileia); Carson (1978), esp. 71-3 (tentitively Viminacium); Lallemand (1972); but the local bronze coinage of Viminacium, which is signed, substantiates that city's claim (R. Bland, personal communication).

61. On the workings of the Licinian Gallic mint, see Göbl (1951), 30-34; Besly & Bland (1983), 31. The date is secure, as its earliest issues include coins for Valerian II, left behind to guard the Danube frontier. For location, see above 2.c.

62. The location of Saloninus' demise at Cologne comes only through the Greek (Dexippan) tradition, which could be mistaken: see Drinkwater (1987), 142f. Even if Cologne were the site of Saloninus' last stand, this does not necessarily mean that this was his "capital" and his mint city. It is possible that the prince may have left his mint city for Cologne in order to secure the loyalty of the frontier troops there when the fateful news from the east added to the growing tension with Postumus. In doing so he probably left behind most of his mint to function in his absence, taking with him a <u>moneta comitatensis</u>, which minted for him as Augustus. It is now clear, however, (<u>contra</u> Shiel (1979); Besly & Bland (1983), 57-8) that the Saloninus Augustus coinage (E.108, E.109, E.114; Göbl (1951), 34) could not have been a siege issue, since too may examples (and too many obverse dies) are known: Gilljam (1987); Bland & Burnett (1988), 45; but cf. Carson (1982), 464f.; Drinkwater (1987), 142f. The earlier PIETAS AVG (E.69/107, cf. 112, 116) antoniniani for Saloninus as

Caesar are perhaps too common (Stevenage 524 records 42 specimens) for the single "G" to refer to Gallienus as sole ruler.

63. Late in the sole reign a third officina was opened up at this mint, and the final issue(s) for Gallienus were marked MP, MS and MT. On the Milan mint see Doyen (1984), esp. pp.162-68; also Göbl (1951), 34; Göbl (1953), 18-23; Besly & Bland (1983), 32-6. On the date of this mint's inception, see also Alföldi, A. (1927), 201; Elmer (1941), 12; Gallwey (1962), 342; Göbl (1970), 43; Drinkwater (1987), 101f. A much earlier date for its establishment (as RIC IV.3, 107ff.) is now rejected, e.g. by Carson (1978) and Elks (1972); likewise the direct transfer from Viminacium advocated by Fitz (1966a), 51f.

64. On the legionary issue(s): King, C. (1984); Doyen (1984), pp.163-4; Besly & Bland (1983), 32ff. On the revolt of Aureolus, see n.71 below.

65. Alföldi, A. (1931) arranged the output into three phases; this was altered to four by Besly & Bland (1983), 38; confirmed by Bland & Burnett (1988), 125; see also Fitz (1984); and cf. Göbl (1953), 23-27 (unnecessarily elaborate). The SISCIA AVG coins: Sisc1a 93-96a. For a later date of inception, see above n.52.

66. The revision outlined in 2.c above, which is the arrangement adopted here, makes Antioch the principal eastern mint for the Licinii in both the joint reign and the sole reign. For references, see above nn. 38-42.

67. Alföldi, A. (1937), 61, followed by Göbl (1951), 37, both support Samosata. Though open to question, Samosata is not unlikely: the city was successfully attacked by Shapur, probably in 256; as a legionary base, it could easily have served as the centre of operations for a counter-offensive shortly thereafter. For further details, cf. above 2.c and note 42.

68. Up to three tribunician years are attested on these coins: XVI (AD 267/8), XVII, XVIII (both of which are impossible). The implication that the mint was in operation for Gallienus for a considerable time (over two years), and throughout that time employed tribunician dates that were two years ahead of their time without correcting the error is difficult to sustain. The reading of XVII and XVIII (Alföldi, A. (1938), pl. XXV, 24 & XXVI, 13) is, however, reasonably secure. On the coinage from this mint under Gallienus in general, see Alföldi, A. (1938),

59-64; Göbl (1953), 30f. On location see above 2.c and n.43.

69. For Postumus' principal mint, see Besly & Bland (1983), 57; and under Victorinus and Tetricus, Bland & Burnett (1988), 148-55; cf. Drinkwater (1987), 146. (See also above, 2.c and notes 44-51 on location.) It is only at this mint that the "control" or "privy marks" are found: see below Ch.4, n.57. Schulte (1983), 24f. places all the gold at the principal mint, thereby setting himself many problems (48-9; 51ff.). In fact it is almost certain that Marius, Victorinus and Tetricus all struck gold at both mints: Besly (1984), 229-30, 232-3; Bland (1988b), 259-60; cf. also C.E. King's review of Schulte (1983) in CR 34 (1984) 385-6.

70. The events surrounding the revolt of Laelian are little understood: Le Gentilhomme (1943), 237; van Gansbeke (1959), 32; König (1981), 133-6; Gilljam (1982), passim, esp. 16-18; Schulte (1983), 44-8; Drinkwater (1987), 175-7. Whether he revolted at Xanten and moved to Mainz (collecting Postumus' Cologne mint on the way?) or was always at Mainz is unclear. Mainz was certainly the centre of his revolt in its later stages (Victor Caes. 33.8; Eutroplus, 9.9.1; Epitome, 32.4); that he might have minted there (as Webb (1933), 369, 373) remains compatible with the new mint arrangement (above, n.47) in spite of the objections of Besly (1984), 230. Schulte's dating and explanation of the coinage of Laelian is questionable (Drinkwater (1987), 139); likewise the contributions of Lafaurie (1964), 114ff., and Callu (1969), 222f. The suggestion that Laelian seized a moneta comitatensis (Pflaum (1957), 279; Lafaurie (1975), 894) is rendered unnecessary by the new arrangement. It is usually assumed that Marius returned this mint to the usual site of the subsidiary mint (Cologne, according to the scheme adopted here); however, there is no evidence to tie minting under M, Vl or T specifically to Cologne. (The tradition that Vl met his end at Cologne is not conclusive, and anyway it is suspect, being tied up with the dubious "Victoria-the-queen-mother" episode: SHA Tyr.trig. 6.3; Victor Caes. 33.12; Eutrop. 9.9.3.) There is therefore no prime facie reason that minting could not have continued at Mainz (until Tetricus' reform, see above n.51; cf. König (1981), 145, who places the move back under Vl). In the interests of avoiding further confusion, however, I shall refer to this mint throughout as "Cologne". On its inception and location, see above Ch.2.c and nn. 45, 47-9.

71. On Aureolus, his position as supreme cavalry commander, and his revolt at Milan: Zos. I.40.1; Zon. 12.24-25; SHA Tyr.trig. 9; cf. Gall 14.6-9. See also Alföldi, A. (1927); Alföldi, A. (1928), 200-203. The connection with the Milan coinage of Postumus, first made by Alföldi in 1927, is now generally accepted: Elmer (1941), 12ff., 40; Lafaurie (1975), 923; König (1981), 125-31; Besly & Bland (1983), 36 (cf. p.37 Table 18 and p.39 fig.3, showing continuity from Gallienus, through Postumus to Claudius); Drinkwater (1987), 31-3, 145-7; Bland & Burnett (1988), 133f.; most esp. see now Bastien (1984). Aureolus may possibly have minted in his own right: so Alföldi, A. (1927), 205f.; Webb (1933), 589. However, the genuine status of these coins is very questionable (indeed the argument now rests largely on a single coin, long since lost): see Bastien (1984), 133-4, 140; Drinkwater (1987), 146 n.82.

72. On Aurelian's Gallic coinage, Bastien (1976), 34-9. It is unlikely that there was a mint at Cologne at the end of Tetricus' reign (see above, note 51); those types Bastien attributes to Cologne (Bastien (1976), 35; pl. LXVIII, 1-3) may possibly be from Antioch. For transfer from the north, Elmer (1941), 93f.; Estiot (1983), 16; cf. above n.51.

73. On Aurelian's first issue at Rome, Manns (1939), 14; Estiot (1983), 33; Bland & Burnett (1988), 132-3. On Divus Claudius, see above note 55. On the dates of the interruption, Estiot (1983), 33. For the relocation of several solar types to this mint at this date, see Kellner (1978), 20. On the sequence of (post-reform) denarii produced at Rome at this time, Bastien & Pflaum (1962), 277-81.

74. On the date of coining in the name of Severina (towards the end of 274) and the proportional output of the various mints for Aurelian, Estiot (1983), 16.

75. On Milan for Aurelian, see now Estiot (1991); cf. also Estiot (1983), 17-19; Kellner (1978), 22-4. For the first issues at Milan, including the consecration issue (apparently minted only in officina T), see above n.55. On date of transfer, Estiot (1983), 19.

76. Estiot (1983), 19-21; on Severina and the proportion of coins from these two mints, see n.74 above.

77. For the general arrangement of Siscia under Aurelian: Estiot (1983), 21-5; cf. Kellner (1978), 25-31. On the early issues, including the consecration issue, see above note 55; on coinage for Severina and on proportion, see above n.74.

78. On the SERD coins: Manns (1939), 30; Estiot (1983), 25; cf. RIC 258, 265, 267, 272. For the general arrangement of the mint, see: Estiot (1983), 25-8; Manns (1939), 44-7, 56-8; cf. Kellner (1978), 33-5.

79. For location at Byzantium: Manns (1939), 31, 33; Callu (1969), 233-4; Estiot (1983), 28; all seemingly supported by CJ 5.72.2 and SHA Aur 22.3. Kellner (1978), 31f. n.1208 opts for Viminacium; Rohde (1881), 405, and Webb (1927), 309, remain undecided. The use of a dolphin as a mint mark is, however, more likely to suggest a maritime than a river port. Estiot (1983), 29-30, places these "dolphin" coins ealler than either Rohde (1881), 408-9, or Manns (1939), 42. The level of production has been shown to be greater than once thought: Estiot (1983), 28 (cf. for small output: Webb (1927), 309, n.2; Kellner (1978), 31f. n.1208). On last issue, Estiot (1983), 30; (on transfer of personnel to Rome) 33.

80. For general arrangement: Estiot (1983), 30-2; cf. Kellner (1978), 36-40. At least one issue (obv. IMP C DOM AVRELIANVS AVG) was issued prior to the Divus Claudius coinage: Bland & Burnett (1988), 145 (cf. above n.55). On early issues for Aurelian at Cyzicus: Manns (1939), 15f., 18f., 20, 25. Certain issues of the middle period of the reign employ the letter C as a mint mark: Estiot (1983), 31.

81. Though the mint of Antioch continued to operate from the reign of Gallienus (see n.41 above), its recognition of Aurelian was only partial. It minted double-obverse coinage for Aurelian and Vaballathus, giving the latter the titles V(ir) C(onsularis or Clarissimus) R(ex) IM(perator) D(ux) R(omanorum): see Manns (1939), 22; RIC V.1, p.260, no.381; cf. Peachin (1990), 403, no.152 and n.31 (cf. analogous coins from the Alexandrian mint: Milne 4303-26). It was probably in the spring of 272, to judge by the Egyptian evidence (P.Oxy XL 2904, 15-23 gives the old titles; cf. Rathbone (1986), 124f.), that this mint began to mint for Vaballathus and Zenobia alone in defiance of Aurelian (see Manns (1939), 23). On the arrangement of the mint after the reconquest, see Bastien & Huvelin (1969), 139-42 (and catalogue, pp.258-67). On problems of arrangement in the eastern mints at this date, see Weder/King (1984).

82. For the arrangement of issues at this mint see Bastien & Huvelin (1969), 143-4 (catalogue, pp.168-70), suggesting only one officina operated here throughout; this goes against Brenot & Pflaum (1965), 140f., 160f.; and indeed most earlier opinion: see Callu (1969), 236; Webb (1927), 261.

NOTES: Chapter 3

"Titles, Insignia and Attributes"

1. Pius Felix for Commodus: Pius, CIL VI 2099, 12 (= Acts of the Arval Bretheren for 7 January 183) and repeated on coins of AD 183; Felix appears on coins of 185, and on inscriptions: e.g. CIL V 4318 (cf. SHA Comm. 8.1); Commodus' triumph was felicissimus: CIL XIV 2922 (=ILS 1420); note the precedent of Sulla Felix. (On Pius Felix, see further n.15 below.) The title Pius was offered to Tiberius under Augustus: Suet. Tib. 17.2; on pietas and Augustus, see Zanker (1988), 102-35; felicitas Weinstock (1971), 112ff. On the sharing of the title Pontifex Maximus, see Kornemann (1930), 79. Athough the title (held by all senior emperors from 12 BC onwards) retained its religious connotations - as can be seen from the fact that Gratian was obliged to drop it, ca. 382, by Ambrose (Zosimus IV.36) - the strength of its "imperial" connotations can be seen in the fact that it was not dropped until that date: see Cornell & Matthews (1982), 193. On standard titles generally, see Hammond (1959), 58-127; Peachin (1990), 1-8.

2. On the second most important imperial title, the praenomen imperatoris, see von Premerstein (1937), 245-60; Campbell (1984), 93ff. The most laconic form of obverse titulature (cognomen + Augustus) was accorded special prominence in Gallienus' sole reign and is also found for Postumus and Aurelian. (For the exceptionally great variety of Gallienus' obverse titulature, see Göbl (1951), 9). On both these titles, cf. below Ch.7.

3. The campaigns of the first twelve months of Aurelian's reign are somewhat confused in the sources, (SHA Aur. 18.2; Zos. I.48); but (pace Zosimus) Aurelian could not have visited Rome at this early stage: see Estiot (1983), 14 n.26; see also Alföldi, A. (1967), 427-30. For Siscia as Aurelian's headquarters at this date, see Manns (1939), 19.

4. The general correlation between imperial consulships and the five-yearly quinquennial and decennial vota is laid out by Burgess (1988), esp. (on the 1st-3rd centuries) 77-81; see also Mattingly (1950).

5. On Postumus' Cos I, see König (1981), 52, 65 (suggesting ornamenta consularia); Drinkwater (1987), 67, 168 n.121. CIL II 5736 (K.58), recording Postumus' Cos IV, Victorinus' Cos I, cannot be dated

very precisely, and the coinage is contraversial (Schulte (1983), 39f.; cf. Besly (1984), 230f.); see also König (1981), 111 (but cf. 68). The dating of Victorinus' imperial consulship is also problematic: CIL XIII 11976 (K.77), 23 May (270 or 271); the coins types PM TRP III COS II PP, E.660 (S.Q3), and COS II, E.704 (S.47), were both clearly minted in his last year (271 = TRP III; the latter was minted alongside the legionary issue, on which see below, Ch.4.a). However, there is no reason these coins could not have been produced the year after his consulship, placing this in 270 (for in 271 Victorinus would still have been Cos II): Elmer (1941), 63, opted for the earlier date; as does Peachin (1990), 100. For 271: Lafaurie (1964), 105; Lafaurie (1975), 931; König (1981), 149; Schulte (1983); and Drinkwater (1987), 180. However, Drinkwater rightly rejects König's reasoning (as the Aeduan revolt must have started after Jan. 270); also note ambivalence of König (1981), 144, Lafaurie (1964), 108 n.1.

6. The association between the consulship and the vota: PM TRP COS III PP VOT X, E.876, 877, 878 (cf. above, n.4). For a quinquennalian interpretation: Elmer (1941), 74f., 79f. (relying on a single, warn and highly suspect coin, E.883, giving Tetricus a fifth tribunician year); Schulte (1983), 66-9 (based on a misreading of an inscription from Beziers, ILS 567 [K.108]); König (1981), 164-7, suggested a very premature quinquennalia. On the other hand, Lafaurie (1975), 943, linked the vota to the elevation of Tetricus II to the consulship; supported with slight alterations of detail by Drinkwater (1987), 98f., 106f., 124f., 186f (cf. also 107 (esp. note 77), 184, refuting Schulte). On vota, see below Ch.4.b.

7. [G] eg.: CIL VIII 1487 (ILS 541) [Africa Proc.]; CIL IX 1559 (ILS 542) [Italy]; CIL X 4784 (ILS 543); cf. the rare appearance in Greek epigraphy, SEG 26 (1976-7), 129 (Peachin, 292); [Med, sr, AV, G] VII DES COS (animal reverses), Göbl (1953), 22 (extremely rare). Only two instances are recorded for [A]: Cos desig III: CIL VI 1112 [Rome], Cos bis designatus, AE 1980, 640 [Orleans, Lugdunensis] (presumably to be understood as "cos II designatus III", since the location of the inscription precludes a date prior to 274).

8. For examples of titular reverses for these emperors, see below nn. 70-71; also Ch.4, nn. 44, 70, 92-3, 96, 119, 125; cf. Appx, tables A:9, nos 7b-e; A:10, no. 7e; A:11, no. 9c; A:13, nos 2a, 5a, 10a, 16a, 17a. The title consul appears alone with its appropriate numeral on occasions: eg. [Tre, An, P] E.586 (Cunetio

2455, 2457); E.591 (Cunetio 2459-61); cf. n.5 above. Or it is found with one other title: eg COS IIII PP [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 150 (Göbl (1953), 13); IMP X COS V [Tre, An, P] E.597 (Cunetio 2462-4). Note also the rev. legend cited in Ch.4, n.132, below.

9. For example, PXV and VIIC were placed in the exergue of certain Antiochene coins of Gallienus as cryptic references to the fifteenth tribunician year and the seventh consulship respectively: see Göbl (1953), 29. COS IIII was appended to certain late Postumianic types from his new mint at Cologne: [Col, An, P] E.584-5. COS III was also appended to a Herculean type: [Tre, AE, P] E.424 (see below, Ch.4b). Also note the reverse legend cited in Ch.4, n.132.

10. Both for Valerian and Gallienus and for Aurelian it is attested before their first imperial consulships (and even, apparently, before their second grants of tribunician power): thus for Aurelian, CIL V 4320, VIII 15450, XI 1180. On deferment of this title as part of an ideology of recusatio, see Béranger (1953).

11. On Laelian's earliest obverses (IP C VLP COR LAELIANVS), see Gilliam (1982), 20. As neither Laelian nor Marius reigned over the December/January period, neither was ever in a position to assume the consulship or even embark upon a second tribunician year. It is perhaps fair to assume, however, that they would have followed Postumus' lead in this regard.

12. A very high proportion of the western emperors' inscriptions are unadventurous in their exclusive useof standard titles in the canonical format; this is not altogether surprising, given the generally conservative nature of inscriptions from the western provinces in the mid-third century. See for example: [P] CIL XIII 9092 (K.34); CIL XIII 9023 (K.35: the earliest datable inscription for P.; cf. also K.35-42); [Vl] CIL 9040 (K.79; cf. also K.76, 78, 89); [T] CIL 8927 (ILS 566 = K.100, on which the title pater patriae is displaced; cf. also K.97-9, 101, 108).

13. For Valerian and Gallienus it was in common usage in inscriptions and papyri (for the latter, see Bureth (1964), 117-121); cf. ὁ δεσπότης ἡμῶν, Peachin 245; 259. The distribution of inscriptions bearing it during Aurelian's reign is fairly even (from Homo (1904), 350-61 and Sotgiu (1961), 81-93): Rome, 2; Italy 6; Sardinia, 2; North Africa, 7; Spain, 1; Moesia, 2; Greek Isles, 2; Asia Minor, 2; Syria, 2; Arabia, 2. To these may be added 9 appearances in the

papyri (Bureth (1964), 123). The preponderance of African examples is commensurate with the high number of inscriptions from that region; the absence of instances from Gaul and Britain is largely due to the brevity of his control of these provinces. On dominus as an imperial title, see further Ch.7.d, below.

14. [P]: CIL XIII 8956 (K.44); RIB 2232 (K.49); RIB 2260 (CIL VII 1161 = ILS 560 = K.51); CIL II 5736 (K.58); it can also be restored with confidence in CIL XIII 8955 and 8957 (K.43, 45); cf. 8956 (K.44). [T2]: ILS 567 (K.108); it may be that the title should also be restored to the very similar inscription CIL XIII 8977 (K.109).

15. The title Invictus was offered to Tiberius, but blocked by Augustus (Suet. Tib. 17.2); cf. Ovid, Trist. 5.1.41f. It was finally taken as an imperial title by Commodus (e.g. Cagnat and Merlin, Ins. Lat. d'Afrique, (1923), no.612), though it did not appear on the coinage until Pescenius and Septimius. On the origins and uses of the imperial title, see Imhof (1957), esp. 207-9. On the significance of its juxtaposition with Pius Felix, see also Berlinger (1935), 20-22; cf. the very unsatisfactory account in Storch (1972). On its connections with the cult of Sol in the third century, see Halsberghe (1972), 26-37; 150-2; cf. below nn. 91, 93, and Ch.4.d.

16. The title Invictus is much in evidence in the epigraphic documents for Gallienus and especially Aurelian: approximately two fifths of the extant inscriptions that bear Aurelian's titles mention Invictus or its equivalent (62 out of the 152 such listed in Homo (1904) and Sotgiu (1961), for example). It is also found for both these emperors in the papyrological record: see Bureth (1964), 121 and 123. For its use on the obverse, see below n.27.

17. Of the extant inscriptions for Postumus, Victorinus and Tetricus, a surprisingly high proportion include, or can be confidently restored to include, the title Invictus: 26 out of the 48 inscriptions supplied in König (1981), 198-218: K. 34-8, 40-42, 76, 78-84, 89, 91, 97-103, 108.

18. The title Germanicus Maximus was taken by both Valerian and Gallienus during the joint reign and continued to be used by Gallienus after his father's capture: inscriptions, e.g. [V] CIL VIII 2380, 20155, 23877; [V & G] CIL XI 826 (ILS 539); ILS 538; [G] CIL VIII 1487 (ILS 541), 2381, 12229, 22464, 22765 (ILS 8923); papyri, see Bureth (1964), 118, 120; coins, GERMANICVS MAX TER [Rom, Jr, An, V] Cunetio 472 (RIC

-); [G] RIC 141 (Cunetio 565); GERMANICVS MAX V [Tre, Jr, An, G] Elmer, 19, 26, 33, 40, 47, 55, 59c (cf. RIC 18). For the use of this title on the obverse, see below n.26. On Imperial cognomina victoriarum generally, see Campbell (1984), 128ff.

19. Dacicus Max: CIL II 2200 (ILS 552); CIL VIII 1430; IRT 927; possibly to be restored to IGRR III 643. Persicus Max: CIL VIII 22765 (ILS 8923); for papyri, see Bureth (1964), 120. Parthicus Max: CIL X 4784 (ILS 543); CIL XI 3089 (cf. AE 1979, 217), 3090a (cf. AE 1979, 218); for papyri, see Bureth (1964), 120, cf. Sijpesteijn (1982), 108f. We should probably add CIL VIII 9040, formerly thought to be Aurelianic, but now conjectured to refer to Gallienus: see Deininger (1970).

20. The GERMANICVS MAX V (trophy between two captives: [AE] B.301-2) are almost certainly hybrids with reverses of Gallienus. PM GM TP COS III PP (same iconography) [Tre, AV, P] E.319 (S.43-6). Germanicus Maximus on inscriptions: CIL XIII 9023 (ILS 561 = K.35); CIL II 4919 (K.36); CIL II 4943 (ILS 562 = K.37). For the preoccupation with the Rhine frontier, van Gansbeke (1955).

21. For the "official" thesis: Homo (1904), 141; Groag (1903), 1356f.; against it, Sotgiu (1961), 26. There are in fact only four documents in which these four "official" titles are presented together in this form and without others: CIL III 7586 (ILS 8925) [Moesia Inf.]; CIL VI 1112 [Rome]; XII 2673 (5571a) [Narbonensis]; AE 1980, 640 [Lugdunensis]; cf. (with persicus in place of parthicus) CIL XII 5561; P.Oxy. 1455, 20; 1633, 30. Among the inscriptions and papyri referring to Aurelian the breakdown of occasions on which the four "official" titles are mentioned is approximately as follows (fragmentation does not allow for exact precision): Gothicus 28; Germanicus 22; Carpicus 14; Parthicus 6 (with an additional 5, possibly 7, attesting the title in the form Persicus). For a full breakdown of Aurelian's cognomina victoriarum, see now Kettenhofen (1986); also Sotgiu (1961), 17-27; Peachin (1990), 91f.; on their dates, Estiot (1983), 14-16.

22. Arabicus Maximus: CIL II 4506 (ILS 576); AE 1936, 129 (Sotgiu, 49). Palmyrenicus Maximus: CIL V 4319. On the probability that the pairs Parthicus/Persicus and Arabicus/Palmyrenicus are interchangeable alternatives of the same title, see Sotgiu (1961), 24. AE 1936, 129 also bears the title Persicus; on this inscription, see Kettenhofen (1986), 139. On the title Persicus refering to defeat of the Palmyrenes:

Kettenhofen (1986), 144; Aurelian may have had to fight against Persians here, but he also actually had Persian allies in this campaign: Zosimus I.54.2-3.

23. Defensive action in the region of Dacia is clearly the sense of the title in the case of Gallienus; on the other hand, in Aurelian's case it might refer to the evacuation of Dacia and the reconstitution of the province south of the river (on which, see chapter 4.c, below). Dacicus Maximus: CIL XIII 8973 (ILS 581); cf. AE 1925, 57 (Sotgiu, 6), though the ascription of this latter to Aurelian is highly tentative. It is thus of little value in corroborating the title of Sarmaticus Maximus; and although this latter title is also found on CIL III 12333 (13714), and probably should thus be restored to CIL III 13715, there is now serious doubt as to whether these refer to Aurelian~~s~~ rather than perhaps to Julian (on which see now Kettenhofen (1986), 140-41, followed by Drinkwater (1987), 123, but not by Peachin (1990), 396). CIL III 12333 (13714; and presumably 13715) also attest Britannicus Maximus, also restored in P.Lips. 119. It is conceivable that Aurelian ordered some military activity in Britain during his resettlement of the western provinces in the summer of 274, or that the title reflects the defection of Britain to Aurelian substantially before Châlons. For this last, König (1974); see also Homo (1904), 121 (and n.3); Groag (1903), 1392.

24. SHA Aur. 30.5; see Sotgiu (1961), 25. The "official" titles listed here are Carpicus, Gothicus and Parthicus; taken all together, the cognomina mentioned here are very reminiscent of the titulature of Caracalla: the apparent (deliberate?) analogy between Aurelian and Caracalla may not have been just a figment of Aurelian's "biographer", but also one sensed by his subjects.

25. Examples of Imperator as an acclamation: [V - Italy] CIL XI 2914, giving Imp V alongside TrP III and Cos II; [Med, sr, AV-medal., Gal] PM TRP IMP VI COS V PP, RIC 3 (Webb places this at Rome, but cf. Göbl (1953), 21); [A - Rome] CIL VI 1112, giving Imp III alongside TrP V and Cos II desig. III. Whether the Imp III in CIL II 2200 (ILS 552) and the Imp X of CIL VIII 1487 (ILS 541) represent different computations of the imperatorial salutations of Gallienus or (inconsistent) calculations of regnal years is not entirely clear. On the question of Imperator as acclamation and as regnal computation, especially with reference to the reign of Gallienus, see Alföldi, A. (1940); see also Campbell (1984), 122ff. For an

example of αὐτοκράτωρ as as acclamation, [A - Cyprus] CIL III 219,I (IGR III 968a = Sotglu, 52).

26. The title Germanicus (Maximus) (abbr. GR, GER, GER M, GER M V, or G M) appears as part of Gallienus' obverse titulature in both the joint reign and the sole reign: e.g. [Rom, Jr] see Besly & Bland (1983), 101f.; [Tre, Jr] Elmer, 45-50, 51a-d; [Med, sr] Göbl (1953), 21-2; [Sis, sr] Göbl (1953), 25 (Siscia [AV] 4-5; Gnecchi I, 54 no.31). Obverse mention of the consulship (as COS V) for Gallienus is much less common, and only in the sole reign (coins apparently reading "COS II" on the obverse are really poorly inscribed versions of COS V): [Rom, sr] Göbl (1953), 14; [Med, sr] Göbl (1953), 21. On the full range of Gallienus' obv. legends, see Göbl (1951), 9.

27. [Ser, An, A] RIC 300-03; for Septimius and Caracalla, BMC V 244-5; see Imhof (1957), 210. [Claudius] RIC V.1 (p.226) 177 (considered genuine by Webb); there was, however, a great deal of fraudulent minting of coins in the name of Claudius under later emperors (see above Ch.2, n.55).

28. RESTI(TVTOR) GALLIAR(VM) [Tre, Jr, An, G] E. 23a-d, 30a-d, 37a-d, 44a-d, 51a-d, 58a-d (prob. referring back to Hadrian's RESTITVTORI GALLIAE: [Den, Hadr.] BMC III 877-82). REST(ITVTOR) GALLIAR [Tre, An, P] E.587-8 (Cunetio 2452); RESTITVTOR GALLIARVM [AEm(Absch?) Vl] E.729. [A]: Restit[ut(ori) Gall]la(rum), CIL XII 2673 (5571a) [Narbonensis] (originally restored as restit[uit mi]lia, but cf. AE 1980, 640).

29. RESTITVT ORIENTIS (emp. raising kneeling "Orlens"); [Ant, Jr, An, V] Cunetio 844, 850, 861, 868, 874 (cf. RIC 286-7; cf. also Göbl (1951), 37f., giving wrong iconography); [Ant, Jr+, An, G] Cunetio 1913-4 (cf. RIC [Jr] 448). Note also the related ORIENS AVG (emp. facing "Orlens") [Ant, Jr+, An, G] Cunetio 1875 (cf. RIC [Jr] 445).

30. RESTITVTOR ORBIS (emp. raising kneeling "Orbis Terrarum") [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 117; [G] RIC 164-5 (on these and other denominations, Göbl (1951), 23). For Hadrian: RESTITVTOR ORBIS TERRAR(VM), RIC II, 416 no.594; 418 no.603 (both are rare); the RESTITVTOR ORBIS coin-type of Gordian III (RIC IV.3 (p.41) 246) is apparently a curious hybrid with the Valerianic reverse. Between Hadrian and Valerian the title is attested in the epigraphic record for Severus Alexander and for Gordian III (for the latter, Peachin [Gord III] 39, 64a, 115).

31. REST(ITVTOR) ORBIS [Tre, An, P] E.592 (cf. Lafaurie (1975), 921; Besly & Bland (1983), 56).

32. [Sis, sr, An, G] (emp. at tripod) Siscia 85a (Göbl (1953), 25, has wrong iconography and the correction of Göbl by Fitz (1981-2), 38f. n. 66 [Fitz/Sis. 154], is still wrong). The other instance is a fragmentary inscription: [Imp Caes P Lic]iniu[s Gallie]nus [Pius Felix Invi]ctus [August]us [Restitutto]r Orbis, AE 1977, 527 (the restoration remains tentative).

33. Types bearing this title became very common for Aurelian: See App., table A:3. The numismatic evidence makes it plain that it first appeared after the first Palmyrene campaign (AD 272), and did not have to wait for the reunification of the whole empire in 274: see Estiot (1983), 15 (esp. n.41).

34. Restitutori Orbis: CIL VI 1112 [Rome]; VIII 10205 (restored) and 10217 [Africa Procos.]; 20537 (Sotgiu 48) [Mauritania Sitif.]; CIL VIII 22361 (Sotgiu 34); Sotgiu 36; Sotgiu 37; Sotgiu 38; Sotgiu 40 (r[est]atut[ori]); Sotgiu 41; Sotgiu 43; Sotgiu 45 (re[...]IIImori orbis); AE 1981, 917 [all Numidia]; CIL XII 5456 (ILS 577); Sotgiu 2 [both Narbonensis]. Many scholars have suggested that we should regard this title as "official", at least from 274 (see Homo (1904), 126; Groag (1903), 1357, 1393; Sotgiu, (1961), 27); this interpretation remains questionable. Note also Restit(utori) totius orbis sui: CIL XI 1214 (cf. orbis sui restituit, CIL VIII 10374); and cf. nn. 41, 44 below.

35. RESTITVT GENER HVMANI [Ant, Jr, An, V] RIC 220 (Syria D 23); [G] RIC 296; (cf. Göbl (1951), 35). RESTITVTORI GENTIS [Byz, An, A] RIC 400-02 (Manns (1939), 41f., ingeniously suggests a reading of RESTITVT ORI<G>ENTIS; but, exceptionally, Webb's reading is to be preferred here). RESTIT(VT) SAECVLI [Sis, An, A] RIC 235; cf. Maravelle 438 (for Saeculum, see Ch.4.c, below).

36. RESTITVTOR EXERCITI [Cyz, An, A] RIC 366. On the identification of Mars on this type, see Ch.4.b below.

37. [V] CIL XI 3310. [G] CIL XIV 5334. CONSERVAT PIETAT [Rom, sr, G] RIC 171a (Cunetio 1297-1302; cf. RIC 171; Peachin 128).

38. IIPRL: de Kisch, Gallia 38 (1980), 343f. (AE 1980, 640 = Peachin 116) [Lugdunensis].

39. DEFENSOR ORBIS: (obv. IMP VICTORINVS P AVG; bust of Victorinus with spear and shield) de Witte, 20 =

Cohen, 29 = S.54 (S.54a = Hunter, p.110, 25 and pl. 29, 25 [Glagow]; S.54b = Lafaurie (1975), pl 5, 92 [Paris]); (obv. IMP C VICTORINVS P AVG; jugate busts of Victorinus and of Jupiter, with a thunderbolt) de Witte 19 = Cohen 30 = RIC 90 = S.55 [Luxembourg]. Confusion over these coins has been promoted by the following: Lafaurie (1975), 932f., confuses the two obverse types (citing his own pl. 6, 92 for the wrong one); Shulte (1983) claims to illustrate the Glasgow example, when in fact it is the Paris version he shows in pl. 21, 54a (sic); RIC 90 appears confused about the obverses (giving the Luxembourg example as being Mars rather than Jupiter; cf. S.55); Elmer (1941), 172 n.1, only mentions the coins in passing. I shall return to the reverse iconography of these rare coins below in Ch.4.b.

40. CONSERVATORI ORBIS (obv.; rev. VBIQVE PAX) [Rom, AVm, sr, G] Gnecchi I, p.7, no.14 (RIC 15 = Peachin 79). Such titles go far back, note e.g. conservator patriae for Tiberius: CIL XI 3872. OB CONSERVATIONEM PATRIAE (Salus rev., with the curious obv. GALLIENVM AVG PR, perhaps referring to some public dedication by the people) [ARm, G] Gnecchi I, p.53 no.22; cf. also Ibid, p.53f. nos.23-4: OB CONSERVATIONEM SALVTIS (AVGG).

41. Restitutor Patriae: CIL III 7586 (ILS 8925 = Peachin 106) [Moesia Inf.]. Conservator orbis: CIL V 4319 (ILS 579 = Peachin 126). Reparator (or Recuperator?) Conservator Patriae: CIL III 12333 (13714); 13715 (cf. Peachin 102; however, on the possibility that these inscriptions may not be Aurelianic, see n.23 above); cf. above, n.40.

42. AE (1915), 104 (de Blois (1976), 127): σωτῆρ; CIG II 2349n (restored; cf. Homo (1904), 358): γῆς σωτῆρ (both overlooked by Peachin).

43. PACATORI ORBIS (Jupiter or emp. as Jupiter) [Ant, Jr, An, V] Cunetio 816 (cf. RIC 218; Syria D 21); [G] Cunetio 817 (RIC 294; cf. Göbl (1951), 35, with the wrong iconogrphy; on iconog. see below n.55). PACATOR ORBIS (bust of Sol) [Tre, An, P] E.599 (Cunetio 2465); this is based on a Septimian prototype: [Den, Septimius] BMC V 354 (and [AV] no.353); also [Caracalla] BMC V [Den] 514, [AV] 513. The title itself dates back to Commodus: Dio 72.15.3ff.; CIL XIV 3449 (AD 192); see Berlinger (1935), 53.

44. PACATOR ORBIS (Emp. sacrificing) [Tre, An, A] E.888 (cf. Bastien (1976), pl. lxiii, 4-5; RIC 4); (Sol with whip) [Lug, An] RIC 6 (Lyon 1, 3, 5, 7, 9; cf. Maraville 112). Pacator et Restitutor Orbis: CIL XII 5561; (restored) XII 5549 [Narbonensis]. Note that

all the attested examples of the application of this title to Aurelian are of Gallic origin, and almost certainly date from after the reintegration of Gaul in 274.

45. PACATOR ORIENTIS [Sis, An, A] RIC 231 (for date, see Manns (1939), 39).

46. Pacatissimus: CIL VIII 10088 (22096); 22113 (Peachin 39); CIL VIII 22103 (Peachin 33); ILT 1732 (Sotgiu 21); 22175 (cf. Peachin 15). This title is known exclusively from the province of Africa Procosularis (pace Peachin 15) and only from these few years: its only other known appearance is for Tacitus (CIL VIII 10089 = 22177 = ILS 590). Superlative titles were relatively common for Aurelian (see below).

47. Victoriosus: CIL XI 1214. [Italy].

48. AE 1936, 129 (Sotgiu 49) [Syria].

49. For Gallienus: CIL XIII 1644 (K.24 = Peachin 141); there is also an unpublished coin minted at Antioch ca. 258-9, with the reverse PRINCIPI IVBENTVTIS (sic); the reverse iconography depicts the bust of an apparently bearded emperor, which may well be intended as a portrait of Gallienus. (My thanks to Roger Bland for bringing this to my attention; cf. the reputed hybrid [Tre, jr, G] RIC 26, not in Göbl (1951), but = Peachin 110.). Note that Caracalla, as joint Augustus with Septimius, had set a precedent: e.g. CIL VIII 884, 2550, 2706, 2707, 4216; see Kornemann (1930), 91. Princ(ipi) Iuvent(utis) [A]: CIL IX 5575 (ILS 575) [Italy]; PRI(N)CIPI IVVENT(VTIS) [Cyz, An A] Maravelle 643 (RIC -); cf. F. Gnecchi, Riv. Ital. di Num., I (1888), 152f.

50. Victoriosissimus [G only]: CIL XI 3090a [Fal/erii; heavily fragmented, but c.f. AE 1979, 218]; AE 1982, 272 [Fal/erii]. Invictissimus [V & G]: AE 1981, 750. Fortissimus: AE 1971, 509 (Paechin 152; fragmentary) [Numidia]; super omnes retro principes fortissimus: CIL XI 3091 (Peachin 92; cf. CIL VI 1107) [Fal/erii]; the formula echoes one such for Gordian III (Peachin (1990), 196 no.230). Invicto Galliено exsuperantissimo Augusto protectori imperii Romani omniumque salutis [auctori] CIL XIV 5334 (Peachin 91) [Ostia].

51. Clementissimus Princeps [G]: CIL VI 1106 (ILS 548 = Peachin 80) [Rome]. SPQR/OPTIMO/PRINCIPI [Rom, sr, AE(AAV?), G] Gnecchi III, p.53 no.54 (Göbl (1953), 14); [Sest.] RIC 393 (c.f. Gobl(1953), 14); [Ant, sr, An, G] Alfoldi (1938), p.48 no.2 (cf. RIC 659; Gobl (1953), 27). These coins play on several themes: the

title naturally recalls Trajan (see eg. BMC III, 54-99, 163-203, 245-315) and the clipeus-in-an-oak-wreath design also recalls the coinage of Antoninus (eg. in BMC IV, pp. 171, 285); cf. also for Septimius (eg. BMC V, 208, 389). Nobilissimi Principes: [V & G] AE 1950, 63 (Peachin 402).

52. Super omn[es pr]incipes Vic[toriosis]simo Imp(eratori): CIL XI 3878. [Italy]. [Fortis]simo et Victoriosissimo Principi: CIL VI 1112. [Rome]. [In]d[u][g(entissimo)] Invictis[s(imo)] Pr[inc(ipi)]: CIL XII 2673 (5571a = Peachin 113); AE 1980, 640; [Narbonensis] cf. note 38, above. Invictissimus also on CIL VIII 22103; Sotgiu 20; [Africa Procos.]. See also App., table A:4, nos. 3-5.

53. Magno Augusto Principi Max(imo) Imp(eratori) Fortissimo Conservatori Orbis: CIL V 4319 (ILS 579 = Peachin 126). [Italy].

54. App., table A:4, nos. 1-2 (only no.1c is not from Africa). The title is in a sense merely a logical extension of the symbolism implied in the praenomen imperatoris. For its more elaborate forms, see table A:4, nos. 3-5.

55. RECTOR ORBIS [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 85 (cf. Göbl (1953), 23); Delbrueck (1940), 49, 101, and L'Orange (1947), 88, see in this an approximation to Zeus Panhellenios, but this is refuted by Doyen (1984), 86. Rector(?) Orbis et Domino Terrarum: CIL XI 3089 (c.f. AE 1979, 217). τ[ὸν] ἄρχοντα τῆς οἰκουμένης: IGRR I.759 [Thrace].

56. [V & G]: P.Oxy. XLVII 3366, 1-4, 40-43 (Peachin 397-8); ὁ παντὸς ἔθνους δεσπότης [V]: AE 1955, 282 (Peachin 75). For Aurelian: ὁ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ πασης οἰκουμένης δεσπότης IGRR I 591 (cf. 1432 = AE 1956, 112 = Sotgiu 10 = Peachin 150) [Moesia Inf.]; cf. IGRR I 582.

57. Magno et Invicto [G]: CIL IX 1559 (= ILS 542); CIL XIV 4058 (= ILS 6224); CIL V 856 (= ILS 547); c.f. CIL V 5030 (probably Gallienus, though this is uncertain). [A]: CIL VI 1114 [Rome]; XIII 8997. [Lugdunensis]. On imitatio Alexandri by Aurelian, see Romano (1966/7); cf. Scarborough (1972/3), esp. 344.

58. Μέγιστος καὶ θειότατος: [V] Peachin 63 [Asia]. [G] IGRR I 759 (SEG 15 (1958), 459 = Peachin 270); AE 1928, 54 (Peachin 282); IGBulg. 883 (Peachin 86). [A] SEG 28 (1978), 578 (Peachin 141) [Thrace]. Gallienus and Aurelian are also accorded the title μέγιστος

alone: [G] IGR III 123 (Peachin 277) [Cappadocia]; [A] IG IV 709 (Peachin 144) [Achaea].

59. [G] CIL V 3329 (ILS 544) [Italy]. [A] CIL XI 3878 [Italy].

60. [G] SPP XX 72, 7; [A] CIG II, p.1069 no.2349n. Note also Aurelian represented as ὁ ἐν θεοῖς : P.Oxy LI 3613, 5 (Peachin 135).

61. DIVO VICTORINO PIO (obv.; rev. CONSACRATIO [sic]) [Tre/Col, An, VI] E.785 (Cunetio 2633, Normanby 1453-4). For the full list of variations, together with the mules and hybrids relating to this issue minted early in the reign of Tetricus, see Bland & Burnett (1988), 148f. (cf. Normanby 1550-2; 1560).

62. Divo Aureliano: CIL III 9758 [Dalmatia]; CIL VIII 10961; 17881; Sotgiu 28; Sotgiu 39; Sotgiu 44 [Numidia]; CIL VIII 25820 [Africa Procos.]; cf. CIL VIII 11318 [Africa Procos.] (erected in Aurelian's lifetime, originally read L. Domiti Aureliani, the form divi Aureliani being substituted after his death). Deo Aureliano: CIL XI 556 (ILS 5687) [Italy]; CIL II 3832; AE 1938, 24 (Sotgiu 1; cf. AE 1972, 284) [Tarraconensis]; CIL VIII 4877 (ILS 585) [Numidia]; Sotgiu 15 [Africa Procos.].

63. Obv. [Ser, An] RIC 305 and 306, respectively. For Domitian, see Suet Dom 13; see further, Ch.7.d below.

64. How we are to interpret these coins remains debatable; but Serdica, although Aurelian's most "adventurous" mint, was in fact a relatively minor one in terms of output (Estiot (1983), 16). On interpretation see Homo (1904), 191-3; Groag (1903), 1406; Sotgiu (1975), 1043f.

65. The "imperial purple" was an extremely important element of imperial insignia (see Avery (1940), 66ff.); its association with the acclamation which accompanied the start of a new reign was crucial (see above, Ch.1, n.16; cf. Victor Caes. 33.28 and Epit. 34.2 on Gallienus' supposed designation of Claudius). On the connections with the republican paludamentum, Alföldi, A. (1935), 49-50; cf. Tac. Ann. 12.56) with Hellenistic royal regalia (on which, Smith (1988), 34). The cloak is often depicted on the coin obverses of our period, though its colour is naturally not.

66. On Augustus and the laurels, see Res Gestae 34.2; cf. Brunt & Moore (1967), 78; on the use of laurels in Hellenistic royal headgear and on its adaptation by Augustus, see Smith (1988), 43. On Apollo and

Augustus, see Ch.7.d below (cf. Ch.1, n.23, above). The obverse use of the laurels persisted on the principal gold coin, the aureus, but due to the near eclipse of the denarius, the laurels were much less common on mid-third century coinage than the radiate crown (on which, see below, n.91).

67. For an example of the oak wreath in imperial portraiture of the later third century, see above Ch.1, n.2. For an example of a "clipeatus" rev. legend in an oak wreath see above, n.51; for the significance of the corona civica see below, Ch.7.d (n.50). On the Hellenistic prototypes (connected with Zeus Dodona) see Smith (1988), 43.

68. Aurelian wearing the diadem and other "regal" clothing: Epit. 35.5; Malal. 299 (Bonn). Groag (1903), 1405, accepts this testimony (as do many modern scholars); it remains very possible, though quite unproven. The situation is confused, however, by the very similar claims with regard to such attire made elsewhere for Gallienus (SHA Gall. 16.4) and Carus (Victor Caes. 39.2). See Alföldi, A. (1935), 36, 64-8; and on the diadem specifically, 145-9; at p.148, he implies that the Severus Alexander colossus wears the Hellenistic royal diadem, but this is not correct. On the origins, form and "meaning" of the Hellenistic royal diadem, and on the misuse of the term, see Smith (1988), 34-38. On empresses and "diadems", see below, n.96.

69. Gnecchi (1912) I, pl. 26, 7; Toynbee (1944), pl. xlvi, 4. Toynbee declares this to be the first numismatic appearance of the imperial "diadem"; also Alföldi (1935), 148f.; Hannestad (1986), 295, goes further, fabricating an elaborate story to account for the oddities of the type. Considerably more caution is required.

70. Examples of titular reverses showing emperor sacrificing: PM TRP II COS PP [Ant, Jr, An, G] RIC 207 (likewise for [V]; and also at both [Rom] and [Vim]: see Göbl (1951), 20, 28, 35, 37); PM TRP VII COS [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 458-60 (and [AV]: see Göbl (1953), 22, cf. 18). PM TRP III COS III PP [AV, P] PM TP IMP V COS III PP [AV, P] E.350-51 (S.78 and note). PM TRP III COS II PP [AVQ, V] E.660 (S.Q3). PM TRP II COS PP [AV, T] S.40 (E.-); PM TRP COS III PP VOTX (both Tetrici sacrificing) [AV/AE, T] S.59-61 (cf. E.876-8). For PIETAS AVG(G) evoking sacrifice, see below, Ch.4.d, n.88 (cf. n.89); also note the rev. iconography cited in Ch.4, n.132.

71. Consular reverse types: (e.g.) PM TRP III COS III PP [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 142b; PM TRP VII COS [Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 22. PM TRP IMP V COS III PP [Tre, AV, P] E.346 (S.62-70); E.348 (S.71). PM TRP COS PP [AV, T] E.799 (Schulte (1983), 173 'a'; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 946).

72. E.358 (S.91-2, 92A-95); E.361 (S.96), dated by Schulte (1983), 33-36, to the winter of 263-4. On interpretation, see Alföldi, A. (1934), 58, and more generally, cf. 42-79; Avery (1940), 67-9. Schulte (1983), 35f., points out that the adoratio might be to the unidentified object that Postumus carries in his hand and not to the emperor. The identity of the object remains in doubt: an analogy with E.346/348 would suggest the emperor carries a globe, but the consistency of the crescent shape across several dies precludes even a poorly depicted globe. One possibility, in keeping with Indulgentia, is that the kneeling figure represents a newly released prisoner and that the crescent object represents a neck shackle ceremonially removed by the emperor (for Indulgentia in this sense of clemency cf. SHA Pius 6.3). It is more likely, however, that the "indulgence" is financial rather than judicial (cf. e.g. Ammianus 16.5.16) and that the figure represents a grateful subject.

73. Consular obv. for Gallienus and Valerian: e.g. [V] Toynbee (1944), pl xxvii, 26; [G] Gnecchi (1912) I, pl. 27, 4; II, pl. 114, 9; Doyen 1-7; see Göbl (1953), 7. For [A]: e.g. Sirmium 935 (cf. RIC 218); from the point of view of dating other such types it is interesting to note that Aurelian was not actually consul when this type was minted, ca. 273: see Manns (1939), 39). For rev., cf. above, n.71.

74. Consular obv.: IMPP TETRICI AVGG (both emperors facing one another) [Absch, T] S.59-60 (cf. E.877-8); for [T2], see further n.107 below.

75. Obv. e.g.: [Sis, An, A] Manns (1939), 39; rev. e.g. [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 85 (cf. above, n.71); also Doyen 8-11. The globe was a symbol of power, often associated with Jupiter and Dea Roma (see below, n.86 and Ch.4.c/4.d) and thus was used both as a token of shared power between co-regents (as Valerian and Gallienus; cf. Caracalla and Geta) or as a token of divine investiture: see Alföldi, A. (1935), 38, 117-20.

76. Military standards were depicted as symbols of the emperor's military valour, esp. for Gallienus and his

sons (see below, n.105; and also Ch.4.b, cf. App., table A:10, nos. 3-4).

77. Obv. types with spear and shield: [Tre, Jr, An, G] Göbl (1951), 32, 34 (incl. [AV] E.90-94; [Med, Jr, An, G] Göbl (1951), 34 (cf. Cunetio 751); [Rom, sr, An, G] e.g. Cunetio 946, 969 (cf. [Den] 1425); [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 12, 29, 57, 100 (cf. [ARm] Fitz/Sis. 44; Siscia 2). [Ser, An, A] Manns (1939), 31; [Sis, An, A] Manns (1939), 38. [An, Vi] E. 742, 734-5, 738, 740, 744var. (Bland (1979), 73f.); [AV, Vi] S. 11-16, 18, 25-8, 34, 45, 54 (cf. E. 666, 662-3, 665, 657, 673, 672, 670, 659, 716, 727, RIC 90). [AV, T] S. 6, 9, 12, 34, 36 (cf. E. 803, 816, 805, 820, cf. 807).

78. The identity of the emperor with Mars was not uncommon in third-century imperial iconography; a clear example can be seen in the statue of Trajan Decius as Mars in the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome. See below, nn. 79-81, and Ch.4.b.

79. Obv. 3/4 back view, nude but for strap, holding spear and shield: [Sis, An, A] Manns (1939), 39 (RIC 219; cf.RIC 213 var.); [Ser, An, A] Manns (1939), 31; [Byz, An, A] Manns (1939), 42.

80. Obv. with helmeted bust: e.g. [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 84a (cf. the rev. type mentioned in App., table A:9, no. 10b). [Tre, AV, P] App. table A:10, no. 10d. (cf. the rev. table A:10, no.10c; note the die link between rev. S.9 and obv. S.10/11); cf. possibly E.179 (Lafaurie (1975), 913; S.19 n.); [Tre, AE, P] B.108-11 (App. table A:10, no. 10d; cf. rev. table A:10, no. 10b). Obv. helmeted bust, also with spear and shield: e.g. [Rom, sr, AV/An, G] Göbl (1953), 9, 13; Carson 865; [Med, sr, An, G] Cunetio 1513; also some from the legionary series (see King, C. (1984), 120ff.). [Tre, AE, P] B. 112-15 (E.210, 220, 230, 240). [Ser, An, A] Manns (1939), 31. Such busts were very likely intended to represent the emperor as Mars: so Doyen (1984), 86 (on Gallienus); Bastien (1967), 60 (on Postumus); see further n. 81 below.

81. Obv. emp. helmeted as Mars obv.: [Col(?), AV, Vi] E.709 (S.53). [Tre, AV, P] E.304 (S.38); E.327 (S.40); E.319 (S.43-6); E.368 (S.47); S.55 (E.-); E.321 (S.56); E.331 (S.57); E.348 (S.71); E.356 (S.72, 76) E.325 (S.77); E.364 (S.89-90); [AVQ, P] E.372 (S.Q5-7); E.375 (S.Q9A). The quinarius type for Victorinus, E.660 ([Vi] S.Q3), may also depict this type of helmet, though the reddition has been too crapmed by the legend to say for certain. The helmeted bust types in any case probably all allude to Mars: see above, n.80.

82. Gallienus in lion-skin obv. Alexander/Hercules: e.g. [AEm, G] Gnecchi II (pp.107-9) 8, 20, 28; III (p.161) no.8; [Sis, AV, G] Siscia 6 (Carson 868). Coins depicting Hercules in this fashion went back before Alexander (e.g. late fifth century Syracuse), but it was their association with Alexander that was the dominant incentive for their use on Hellenistic royal coinage: see Smith (1988), 40. Also note the occasional types depicting G. as Herc.: [Med, sr, An, G] (emp. with club) AETERN AVG, PROVID AVG Hunter xlvii (cf. RIC 465a, RIC 509a; the last issue of the mint of Milan, before its occupation by Aureolus). ~~[Sis, sr, An, G]~~ The Siscian mint too produced some obverse types with a lionskin and club: [Sis, sr, An, G] AEQVIT AVG Siscia 7; PAX AVG Siscia 67. For Commodus' Imitatio Alexandri types see, e.g. BMC V, 717, 725. The reference back to the last of the Antonines is as interesting for our present purpose as the implied references to Hercules and Alexander.

83. Obv. P. with club over r. shoulder, lionskin on l. [Tre, AV, P] S. 111, 140, 151; [An] E. 558, 560, 562, 564.

84. Obv. P. in lionskin Alexander/Hercules: [Tre, AE, P] E.378 (B.129). See above n.82. For Postumus and Hercules, see below Ch.4.b.

85. On the question of the aegis on this coinage, and the suggestion that the almost ubiquitous shoulder divice might represent it, see Bastien (1980), 252ff., esp. 262. Once again the aegis is borrowed from Hellenistic iconography: see Smith (1988), 41-2. Examples for Aurelian: RIC 8 (cf. also pl. VII, 107); note gorgoneion on the cuirass (Sirmium 116; cf. other examples Manns (1939), 31, 39) and on the shield (Sirmium 936 = RIC 219). On elaborate imperial armour, Alföldi, A. (1935), p.67f. (cf. below, Ch.5, n.1). Note also the use of the gorgoneion on PROVIDENTIA AVG [Tre, AV, VI] E691-2 (S.23, 22); a type which was modelled on Septimius' PROVIDENTIA type: BMC V [AV] 355; cf. [Den] 356.

86. Obv. with eagle-topped sceptre: [G]: Doyen 1-4; [A]: e.g. Sirmium 935 (cf. RIC 218; Manns (1939), 39). On the significance of the sceptre generally, see Alföldi, A. (1935), 71, 110-116 (the eagle-topped sceptre as a Jovian triumphal insigne, associated with victory, cf. ibid., 38, 112-13; the long sceptre as an attribute of Zeus, and thus also Jovian: ibid., 114-16). On Jupiter cf. above, n.75; and see below, Ch.4.d.

87. VIRTVS GALLIENI AVG (obv. nude with caduceus and cloak) [Rom, sr, AVm, G] Gnecchi I, p.8 no.19; VIRTVS AVGVSTI [Rom, sr, AEm, G] Gnecchi II (p.109) 35 (cf. pl. 115, 3). See Bastien & Arnold-Blucchi (1983), 73-5, cf. figg.1-4. To these should be added [Rom, sr, An, G] rev. FORTVNA REDVX, cited in Numismatisches Nachrichtenblatt, June 1989 (my thanks to Roger Bland for bringing this to my attention). On Hellenistic precedents for this iconography, Bastien & Arnold-Blucchi (1983), 78-9; on possible associations with Augustus, ibid, 79-83; Gagé (1930), 180; Rosenbath (1958), 34; de Blois (1976), 126, 130, 150. To what extent these represent the emperor as Mercury, and to what extent as the guarantor of felicitas saeculi is difficult to judge, though no doubt both interpretations are correct: see below Ch.4.c, and nn. 69-70.

88. Obv. nude with caduceus and cloak for Aurelian: [Sis, An, A] RIC 221, 228 (Rohde 147, 190); [Byz, An, A] RIC 394; 408 (Rohde 186, 401; both with and without dolphin mint mark). On interp. see above n.87; the connection with "Wodan", suggested by Manns (1939), 29, must certainly be rejected. See Bastien & Arnold-Blucchi (1983), 75-6, 84-5, cf. figg.5-8; also Groag (1903), 1393, 1406.

89. GALLIENAE AVGVSTAE obv. [Rom, sr, AV, G], revv. VICTORIA AVG (Victoria crowning Gallienus), VBIQUE PAX (Victoria in a biga); the same rev. types were also minted with other obverse legends, but always the "Demeter crown" portrait: Göbl (1953), 16f. Also note [AVm] obv. CONSERVATORI ORBIS ("Demeter crown"), rev. VBIQVE PAX (as before): see above, n.40. For the mysteries interpretation: Wickert (1926), 367-8; Göbl (1953), 17; Rosenbach (1958), 15-36 (esp. 28ff.), who took the sense to be adjectival. This is surely correct. There are many precedents even in the first century: note e.g. Agrippina the Younger portrayed as Demeter on civic coinage (see Price, S. (1984), 184); cf. an inscription to Ceres Augusta IRT 269. For the Hellenistic "Triptolemos" precedent, see Smith (1988), 43. Mattingly (1960), 154, and de Blois (1976), 151-4, 185-95, prefer to see Gallienus as Kore here. On the inventiveness of Gallienus' sole-reign obv. iconography, see Doyen (1984), 85f.

89a. For the masculine vocative, see Kent (1973); Carson (1980), 110. Taeger (1960), 441, suggested a genuine fusion of masculine/feminine godhead in the person of Gallienus. The suggestion that the types were minted as (very expensive) anti-Gallienic propaganda places too much emphasis on the biased literary accounts of

the reign: see Alföldi, A. (1928); cf. Alföldi, A. (1967), 241-4.

90. The Siscian types (minted possibly slightly later with very similar obv. iconography, but ordinary obv. legends): [Sis, sr, AV, G] Siscia 3, 8, 14 (this last gives a terminus post quem of AD 266). Kent (1973), 67, (wrongly) rejects the idea that these were minted at Siscia.

91. On the Hellenistic origins of the radiate crown, Smith (1988), 42. Whether or not emperors at this date actually wore radiate crowns is less easy to tell, but on the whole it seems highly probable: see SHA Gall 16.4 (where its solar connotations are made explicit). By means of this symbol Nero had associated himself with his deified predecessors and forbears. (For its denominational value to mark the "radiate", see above Ch.2.b.) on the radiate crown in particular, see Alföldi, A. (1935), 107f.; 139-44. Like Nero, Gallienus apparently intended a colossus of himself as Sol/Helios to be set up in Rome: SHA Gall. 18.2-4 (cf. the gold dust in 16.4); see Rosenbach (1958), 41-52; on Nero's colossus, upon which it was supposedly based, see L'Orange (1953), 28-34. On iconographic parallels between the emperor and Sol, and the empress and Luna, see also Ch.3.d and Ch.4.d, below. An obv. cuirass for Aurelian shows twin busts of Sol and Luna: Sirmium 1431 (cf. RIC 260). On light and solar imagery in the representation of imperial authority, esp. with reference to Septimius and Julia Domna as sun and moon, see L'Orange (1935); L'Orange (1947), 61, 88-90; Kantorowicz (1963), 131ff.; Alföldi, A. (1934), 111-18.

92. Obv. (laureate/radiate) [Tre, AV, P] S.100-04; (do., jugate with Hercules) S.123, 125, 128, 133, 141, 149, 152; [AE, P] E.184 (B. 132); (3/4 face, radiate) S.104, 138. The use of laureate rays was apparently another example of Postumus' "borrowing" from the iconography of Commodus: see Alföldi, A. (1935), 144. Of the other radiate pieces included in Schulte (1983), the Milan types (S.164-5) were struck from antoninianus dies, and the radiate billon examples of the labour series were clearly antoniniani (see below, Ch.4, n.55).

93. Obv. (with hand raised) [Med, sr, G] Doyen 8-13; [Tre, AV, P] E.181 (S.9); [AE, P] B.116-23 (E. 212, 222, 242, 252, 272); for an earlier precedent, cf. [Geta] BMC V 244. On the interpetation and probable solar connection, see Bastien (1967), 60f.; Alföldi, A. (1935), 107-8; L'Orange (1953), 139-70; cf. Brilliant (1963), 210-11; Doyen (1984), 92-5.

94. The rare bronze coins, obv: GENIVS P.R., rev: INT VRB SIC (within a wreath): [Rom, AE, sr, G] Göbl (1953), 16 (dating them to Gallienus' return from Grecce to take up his seventh consulship in AD 266); see also Delbrueck (1940), 48, 101; de Blois (1976), 126, 150f. Webb (1927), 35, 361, placed them in the "interregnum" following Aurelian's death; Grant (1950), 139-40, suggested the reign of Aurelian itself. See now, however, Younge (1979), esp. 50-51 (on dating to late in Gallienus' reign), 56 (suggesting AD 268), 53-4 (on proportion and degree of similarity with the features of Gallienus), 54-6 (on interpretation). The many coins referring to GENIVS AVG (e.g. [Rom, sr, G] RIC 44; 198; 197) perhaps have some bearing on this theme, since there arose during the empire a close association between the emperor's genius and that of the capital: see MacCormack (1975); cf. below, Ch.4.c.

95. Coins began to be issued in the name of Salonina from 254 (see Göbl (1951), 20, 28); for the various obverses in use for her, see Göbl (1951), 9 (all bear exclusively the title Augusta). On Severina as Augusta, see above Ch.2.d n.74. The commemorative DIVAE MARINIANAE issues also began in 254 (see Göbl (1951), 20f.; cf. below, Ch.4, n.106).

96. On the stephane in relation to Hellenistic queens, especially with reference to posthumous images of deified queens, see Smith (1988), 43. It was first used extensively on Roman imperial coinage for Julia Domna; by the mid-third century it was standard. To my knowledge, the only numismatic work to refer to this insigne as a stephane, as oppsed to "diadem", is Hunter. For the obv. busts wearing the stephane accompanied by a crescent moon in relation to the radiate busts, see above n.91; see also below Ch.4 n.72, and for further solar/lunar affiliations, below 4.d.

97. IGRR I 697 [Thrace], reinforcing the repetitive nature of the titluature.

98. Thus e.g. [Sa] CIL XI 3091, 3092 [Falerii, Italy]; [Sv] CIL V 29 [Italy]; AE 1894, 59 [Africa Proc.]; and the Greek equivalent: e.g. [Sa] IGRR III 273 [Galatia], IV 777 [Asia]; cf. III 237 [Galatia]; [Sv] AE 1900, 145 [Lydia].

99. For [Sa]: CIL V 857; CIL XI 3091; AE 1982, 272 [Italy]; (as "μητέρα κάστρων") IGRR III 237 [Galatia]. [Sv] CIL V 29 [Italy]. Matri Cast(rorum) et Senatus et Patriae: [Sv] AE 1930, 150 (Sotgiu 56 = RIT 87) [Tarraconensis].

100. [Sa]: CIL II 2200 (ILS 552) [Baetica]; CIL VIII 25843; [Sv] AE 1930, 150 (Sotgiu 56 = RIT 87) [Tarraconensis]; CIG II, p.1069 no.2349o [Andros].

101. [Sa]: CIL III 10206; CIL V 7879 (ILS 551); CIL VI 1106 (ILS 584); CIL XI 3091; 3092; AE 1982, 272 [the last three from Fal/eriI]. [Sv] Dominae [Sanc]tissimae [Ulpiae Severinae P]issimae Aug(ustae): AE 1930, 150 (Sotgiu 56).

102. [Sv]: CIG II (p.1069) 2349o; [Sa]: IGRR I 697; IV 777.

103. AE 1927, 81 (Sotgiu 57).

104. For the various forms of coin obvv. [V2/Ss], see Göbl (1951), 9-10. As nobilissimus Caesar on inscriptions: e.g. [V2] CIL XII 12 (ILS 553) [Alpes]; [Ss] CIL XI 5380 (ILS 559). Examples erroneously giving title "Augustus": [V2] CIL 2382 (K.3); CIG 1621 (IG VII 3105 = Peachin 452); papyri, Bureth (1964), 118-19; [Ss] CIL VIII 2383 (K.4). For the coinage of Saloninus as AVGVSTVS, see Shiel (1979) and most recently Gilljam (1987).

105. PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS (and abbreviations): e.g. [Rom, Jr, An, V2] RIC 23; [Rom, Ss] RIC 27-8; (next to standards) [Tre, V2] E.67, 67c; [Med, Ss] RIC 10 (Cunetio 758-9); (next to trophy) [Tre, An, Ss] Elmer, 106, [AV, AAV] Elmer, 111, 115; (prince crowning trophy) [Ant, An, V2] RIC 49 (Cunetio 875). On inscriptions: e.g. [V2] CIL III 4652 (ILS 555); CIL XII 12 (ILS 553); [Ss] CIL XI 5380 (ILS 559). On the iconography, cf. below Ch.4.b; for the title applied to [G] and [A], cf. above, n.49.

106. PRINCIPI IVVENTVTIS (and abbreviations): (globe & spear) [Absch., T2] E.882 (S.3; cf. Lafaurie (1975), pl. 6, 113); [Absch, T2] S. Q1 (Lafaurie (1975), pl. 6, 114); [Absch, T2] S.5-6 (E.-, cf. RIC 281); (standard & spear) [Absch., T2] E.881 (S.4); [An, T2] Normanby 1531. The only inscription is Espérandieu 656 (K.114). Though it has been argued that the elevation of Tetricus II was a more gradual advancement than was customary (e.g. König (1981), 164-7), the evidence is very limited and it is preferable to see it as following a more traditional pattern (as Drinkwater (1987), 106-8, 124-5, 184-7).

107. Inscription: Espérandieu 656 (K.114). Obverse iconographic references on the coinage: E.875 (S.1); S.2 (E. -); and cf. above, n.74.

NOTES: Chapter 3

108. [V2]: CIL III 5739 (Peachin 305) [Noricum]; IGRR III 481 (ILS 8870 = Peachin 313) [Lycia]. [Ss] CIL XII 57 (K.17 = Peachin 331) [Alpes]. [T2]: see above, n.14.

109. [V2] SEG 19 (1963), 452 (Peachin 318); SEG 24 (1969), 969 (Peachin 427); [Ss] IGRR IV 776 (Peachin 458); also θεοσεβέστατος καὶ θεοφιλέστατος [V2] AE 1939, 25 (Peachin 453).

110. CIG 1621 (IG VII 3105 = Peachin 452) [Achaea]; ἱερώτατος: Bureth (1964), 118 (Peachin 428).

111. [V2] CIL VIII 8473 (ILS 557); CIL IX 5682 (ILS 556); cf. SEG 19 (1963), 452. DIVO obv., Göbl (1951), 9-10; and on this CONSECRATIO coinage, see below Ch.4.d, n.106.

NOTES: Chapter 4

"The Victorious Emperor and the Divine"

1. On the special relationship between the emperor and the armies in this context, see Campbell (1984), 19-156; Nock (1972), II 736-90 (= "The Roman Army and the Roman Religious Year," H.Th.R. 45 (1952), 186-252). See also Davies (1968), for a plausible and interesting observation on a connection between the loyalty of the troops and the imperial image in association with army pay.

2. Thus the first issues from Rome and Viminacium: Göbl (1951), 20, 27f. Types include [Rom, Jr, An, V]: CONCORDIA EXERCIT RIC 81; CONCORDIA MILIT RIC 238 (Cunetio 440); FIDES MILITVM RIC 89; cf. [An, G] RIC 132, 137; and [AV, V] 34-35. [Vim, Jr, An, V]: CONCOR(DIAE) EXERC(ITI) RIC 233 (Cunetio 761); FIDES MILITVM RIC 241 (Cunetio 765); cf. [An, G] Cunetio 762 (RIC -); RIC 377, 379.

3. On gold issues from the Roman mint in these crucial years (FIDES MILITVM, FIDEI PRAET, FID PRAET VOTA X) [Rom, sr, G]: Göbl (1953), 13-14; cf. [Absch] RIC 480 (Cunetio 1001-5); RIC 568 (Cunetio 998); Cunetio 999-1000 (cf. RIC 569; Normanby 101, wrongly reading FIDEI). On the vota decennalia, see below, 4.b; for

special mention of the Praetorians, see also below, n.18.

4. FIDES MILITVM (eagle) [Tre, Jr, An, G]: E. 18, 25, 32, 39, 46, 53, 59b (see Göbl (1951), 31-3; [AV, V1] RIC 7 (E.-); Schulte (1983), 173, 'd', suggests that this latter coin belongs in his Group 3b; i.e. that it was minted alongside the legionary issue (Group 3a; on which see below, n.21).

5. FIDES MILITVM (Fides holding 2 standards) is a common theme in the coinage of the western emperors: [Tre, QAV, P] E.192 (S.Q3); [An, P] E.133/189 (Cunetio 2386); [AE, P] E. 227-9, 231, 233-5 (B.68-79, etc.; cf. B. 78-9, 300, 319, 324: not in Elmer); [Col, An, L] Gilljam (1982), 20, cf. pl. L, 135; cf. Besly & Bland (1983), 61, doubting authenticity of this piece); [Col, AV, M] E.642 (S.6); [Tre, An, V1] E. 648, 654, 684 (cf. Cunetio 2515, 2522); [AV, V1] E.645 (S.1); [Col, An, T] E.782-4 (Cunetio 2634-6); [AV, T] E.839 (S.-; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 947). Note also FIDES EXERCITVS (4 vertical standards) [AV, P] E.408 (S.101); [An, P] E.417 (Cunetio 2432); and CONCORD(IA) MILIT(VM) [Tre, An, M] Cunetio 2502-4 (cf. E.632-3). Marius' military types probably represent his attempt to regain stability and military loyalty after the disasterous events in Mainz: see König (1981), 139. PMTRPIIICOSPP (Fides with standard and sceptre) [Tre, AV, T] E.822-4 (S.42-6).

6. FIDES MILITVM (or abbr.) [Rom, AV, A] Manns (1939), 15 (cf. RIC 93); [Rom, An] RIC 28 (Normanby 1242); [Med, AV, A] Milan 2-3 (RIC 91); [Med, An] RIC 109 (Normanby 1257); [Sis, AV, A] Manns (1939), 17 (cf. RIC 90, 94); [Cyz, An] RIC 328. Note also the unusual iconography of FIDES MILITVM (Emp. between 2 standards) [Rom, An] RIC 46 (cf. Maravelle 26). For the association of Aurelian with Jupiter in this context see below, 4.d and App. table A:14.

7. The wide distibution, both in time and across the various mints, of military "CONCORDIA" types for Aurelian is impressive. The references are too complex to permit their inclusion here, but the evidence is tabulated in App. table A:5. For the association of Aurelian with Jupiter in this context see below, 4.d and App. table A:14.

8. CONCORDIAE MILITVM [Rom, An, Sv] RIC 4; [Tic] RIC 8; [Sis] RIC 13; [Cyz] RIC 18; [Ant] RIC 20 (Syria B 25 etc.; Syria C 158 etc., 189 etc.; cf. Weder/King (1984), 206); cf. CONCORD MILIT [Lug, An, Sv] RIC 1 (Lyon 4, 6, 8, 10). (Unconfirmed, RIC 11-12.) On a

possible further significance of certain of these coins see above, Ch.2.c at n.58; cf. App. table A:1.

9. For the medallions and multiples with the legend ADLOCVTIO AVGVSTORVM [Jr, V/G] see Göbl (1951), 26f. Note also the adlocutio scene on Postumus' EXERCITVS AVG [Tre, AE, P] E.199 (B. 20-21, 140, 154, 195; cf. B. 141, 155, 261).

10. On Aurelian's VIRTVS MILITVM types, together with the parallel -AVG types, see App. table A:6. Note also for Postumus VIRTVS EXERCITVS (App. table A:10, no. 7f; cf. Schulte (1983), 172 'f'; E.322). For other related virtus types, see table A:10 and further below, Ch.4.b.

11. For VIRTVS ILLVRICI see App. table A:9, no. 8b (cf. Manns (1939), 33, 43); on the appearance of Mars on such types more generally, see below, Ch.4.b. GENIVS ILLVR [Sis, AV, A] RIC 172-3; [Sis, An] RIC 204; 223 (Maravelle 398-401; Sirmium 452-8); GENIVS ILLV [Med, An] RIC 110 (Normanby 1255-6). It may be that Genius Illyrici amounts to something like the personification of the esprit de corps of the Danubian legions. Note also GENIVS EXERCITI [Cyz, An, A] RIC 345 (Maravelle 632; Sirmium 1539-42).

12. Pairs of Aesculapius types: [Tre, An, P] SALVS EXERCITVS, E.418 (Cunetio 2433, cf. 2434); SALVS AVG, E.415 (Cunetio 2435), E.416 (Cunetio 2436). The parallel is also mirrored in the gold issues: [Tre, AV, P] SALVS EXERCITVS, E.411 (S.102); [Absch, P] E.405 (S.10), E.406 (S.11), S.12 (RIC 363; cf. E.406). The obv. die link between S.12 and S.13 permits one to suppose ~~these to~~ these bronzes to have been intended for gold. For the "plague thesis", Elmer (1941), 35f.; cf. now Drinkwater (1987), 171-3. The Aeculaplan type SALVS AVG [Med, An, P], E.618 (Cunetio 2496), was minted alongside coins that otherwise exclusively refer to the cavalry; for the rest of the [Med, P] series, see below, n.16.

13. CIL XVI 155 (ILS 2010) [Italy]. The renaming of army units with cognomina taken from the reigning emperor started with Commodus: see Dio 72.15.2 (cf. the fleet: SHA Comm. 17.8.). On this practice in the third century, see Fitz (1983), passim; Campbell (1984), 88-93. (On the equivalent association with civil communities, cf. below, 4.c.)

14. Postumiana: RIB 605 (CIL VII 287; ILS 2548; K.61); RIB 1883 (CIL VII 820; ILS 2553; K.59); RIB 1886 (CIL VII 822; K.60); Tetriclanorum: RIB 1885 (CIL VII 823; K.107) [all from northern Britain]. On the

significance of this last for the extent of the territory controlled by Tetricus, see Drinkwater (1987), 123; see also König (1981), 168f. For Aurelian: Legio III Augusta Aureliana, CIL VIII 2665 [Numidia]; Cohors Pimasensis Aureliana, AE 1908, 136 (Sotgiu, 65) [Serdica].

15. FIDEI EQVITVM, FIDES MILITVM, ALACRITATI [Med, sr, AAV/Absch, G] Göbl (1953), 21 (cf. RIC 33, 445-6; also RIC 545). The context of the "Alacritati" type makes it almost certainly military; indeed the iconography is specifically associated with the Legio II Adiutrix in the "legionary" issues of Gallienus and Victorinus (see table 4:1 in text; cf. App. table A:7). Such winged horses in reverse iconography are conventionally described as "Pegasus", though other identifications are possible such as the horses of Sol's chariot. On the establishment of a cavalry force at Milan, see Alföldi, A. (1927); Alföldi, M.R. (1957); de Blois (1976), 26-36.

16. FIDES AEQVIT (Fides seated with standard) [Med, An, P] E.603; (- EQVIT) E.606; (- EQVIT /P) E.612. CONCORD AEQVIT (Concordia with rudder, ship's prow) [Med, An, P] E.604; (- EQVIT) E.607; (- EQVIT /S) E.613. PAX EQVITVM /T (Pax) [Med, An, P] E.620. For VIRTVS AEQVIT (- EQVIT; - EQVIT /T) [Med, AV/An, P] see App. table A:9, nos. 2c-d; VIRTVS EQVITVM /S (Hercules) [An] App. table A:11, no.1d.

17. Once again note the parallel iconography of the VIRTVS AVG type minted alongside: see App. table A:6, no.2. For other such portrayals of the emperor as military commander in the context of virtus see also App. table A:10.

18. C(o)HORS TERTIA PRAETORIA [Rom, sr, Quat(?), G] RIC, 7 (p.131; = Cohen, 103; cf. Gnecchi (1912), I p.6, no.2, reading "COHORS") Göbl (1953), 12-14. See also above n.3.

19. [Med, sr, An, G] Cunetio 1435-1503; cf. RIC (jr) 315-372; for the particulars of the issue see King, C. (1984), passim (note esp. the catalogue, pp.120-25, and table VII, p.116); Göbl (1953), 19f. Septimius' legionary issue: BMC V, lxxxii-iii, xcvii, 21ff., 118); see Laffranchi (1938); note also the even earlier precedent of the issue under Hadrian and Aellus: RIC II, pp. 457ff.; cf. Kornemann (1930), 72. Septimius' issue was an accession donative: Birley (1988), 104-5. On date of Gallienus' issue: King, C. (1984), 106-14.

20. Supposing whole legions: Alföldi, A. (1929), 242-62; Laffranchi (1938); and Fitz (1966b). Proposing vexillations only: Alföldi, M.R. (1957). On the intricacies of the problems involved, see King, C. (1984), 114-19; cf. also the over-stated interpretation of de Blois (1976), 109f. King, C. (1984) 104, suspected that the suffix VP VF was possibly an error (on resulting problems of interpretation, p.117); however R. Bland (personal communication) doubts this to be the case. The "III Pia Fidelis" found on CIL III 875 [dedicated to V, G, V2 and Sa by the prefect of Leg V Mac III Piae Fid(elis)] may be an earlier example of the numberings we find in the legionary issue. On the problems of victory salutations in this context, see below, 4.b.

21. [Col(?), AV, VI] E.711-28; S.29-46; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 934. For the breakdown of Victorinus' legionary issue, see App. table A:7. Like Gallienus' issue (upon which it was probably based), this issue honours legions the bases of which come from all over the empire (for distribution, see König (1981), 153f.). Elmer (1941), 63-5, saw this issue as a part of a donative associated with a victory parade, once again honouring the vexillations that made up the emperor's main army. This interpretation has been largely followed by others: König (1981), 153-5; Schulte (1983), 57; Drinkwater (1987), 180-81. Schulte (contra Elmer, Lafaurie and others) claims the series was minted exclusively at the main mint; serious doubts, however, must be placed on his insistence on one mint for gold, and it remains very possible that this issue was the product of the second mint (so Besly (1984), 232).

22. VIRTVS MILITVM [Col, AV, L] (probably minted at Mainz): S.5 (E.624); cf. Gilljam (1982), 20. On the various interpretations of this coin and its bearing upon the details of Laelian's revolt see above, Ch.2.d n.70. An inscription from the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus (CIL XIII 6780 = K.30) indicates that certain vexillations were indeed stationed at Mainz in this period (cf. above, nn. 20, 21).

23. The ideas put forward by Gagé (1933) have since been elaborated and refined by others: note esp. Amit (1965); Storch (1972); Fears (1981), who supplies a detailed bibliography on the subject.

24. CIL VIII 2482 (= ILS 531) [Numidia]; cf. ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας καὶ νίκης: IGRR III 1287-8; OGIS 614. Victory types were produced at every mint in the joint and sole reigns. For the standard types issued (VICT(ORIA) AVG(G) - Vict. with wreath and palm), see

Göbl (1951), 20ff., 30, 35; Göbl (1953), 12f., 24ff., 27f. Of the numerous variations, note VICTORIAE AVGG (Vict. in biga) [Ant, Jr, An, V] RIC 276; VICTORIA AVGVSTI (Vict. with trophy) [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 106; and see further below, nn. 28-9, 34, and App. table A:8. A gauge of the importance of the theme of victory for Valerian and Gallienus can be seen in the Cunetio hoard: of the individual specimens from the mint of Rome in the joint reign 16% (721/4432) of those minted for Valerian and 20% (305/1523) of those for Gallienus make specific reference to victory (figures based on evidence supplied by Besly & Bland (1983), pp.97-102; cf. 24, Table 8).

25. Indeed, victory types account for the vast majority of the antoniniani in the names of Laelian and Marius. For P's earliest victory types (Cunetio 2369-70; Baval pl. 1, 30) see above, Ch.2.c, n.48. Standard types: VICTORIA AVG [P] S.1 (E.122); E. 125, 132; [L] E. 621-2, 625 (Cunetio 2499-501; cf. also (E.-), Gilljam (1982), 20, pl. G, 50 (Lafaurie (1975), pl. III, 66); [M] S.5 (E.628); E. 631, 635, 636-9; cf. also (E.-), Cunetio 2510 (Lafaurie (1975), pl. IV, 72); [V] S. 10-12, 50, 52-3 (E. 666-7, 707-9); E. 698, 744; [T] S.11-13 (E.804-5); E. 747, 762, 765, 768. In addition note: VICTORIA AVG (Vict. in biga) [AV, P] S.12-15 (E. 170-71, 173-4); VICTORIA AVG (Vict. with trophy) [AV, T] S.19 (E.832); (- AVGG) S.65-8 (cf. E. 832, 847-8, 850).

26. Standard types: VICTORIA AVG [AV, A] Manns (1939), 14, 25, 36, 43 (cf. RIC 12, 95-6, 177-8, 376-7; Milan 31, 34-6, 41-3); [An] RIC 39, 143-4, 236-7, 272, 338, 354, 406; also VICTORIA AVG (flying) [Sis, An] RIC 238 (Sirmium 512). Note also Victoriae Aug(ust) n(ostri): CIL VIII 11318 [Africa Procos.] (cf. above Ch.3.b, n.62).

27. For example, Lallemand & Thirion (1970), 25f., conjectured that one particular generic VICTORIA AVG type (E.698; Cunetio 2549) referred to Victorinus' triumph over Autun; Thirion (1973), 81, later changed his mind; but the idea was reinforced by Bland (1979), 69f. On this now see Besly & Bland (1983), 62.

28. VICTORIA AVG VII [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 526 (Cunetio 1588-9). VICTORIA AVG III [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 304, 305 (Cunetio 890; 948-58); VIC GALL AVG III, Cunetio 888 (cf. RIC 296); VICT GAL AVG III, RIC 295. Certain of these legends were also simultaneously minted at [Med]: see Göbl (1953), 18f.; Cunetio 1568; cf. also VICT GAL AVG [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 294. On the Roman types, see also Göbl (1953), 12-13; King, C. (1982); on VICTORIA AVG III being perhaps retrospective,

Laffranchi (1938), 207-9; cf. King, C. (1984), 118; and see above, n.20.

29. VICTORIA AVG VIII [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 527 (Cunetio 1560-63). Note also FIDES EXERC VIII [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 478 (Cunetio 1515; cf. 1508-16). One possible explanation involves the notion of one set of victory numberings starting again from scratch at the beginning op the sole reign (see Alföldi (1929) esp. 246-8); but even this fails to satisfy all the difficulties. These difficulties and their various possible solutions are discussed at some length by King (1984), 114-19. There is curiously no (extant) suffix "IV" from either the joint or the sole reign. On the iteration of the titles Imperator and Germanicus Maximus, see above Ch.3 nn. 18 & 25.

30. CIL III 12456 [Moesia Inf.].

31. Victoriae aeternae Aureliani Aug(usti) n(ostri): CIL XI 6309. (Estiot (1983), 31, cites an Aurelianic coin with the rev. legend VICTORIA AET (RIC -) from the Çanakkale hoard.) VICTOR(IA) AETER SC [Rom, Jr, AE, V] RIC 176. VICTORIA AET [Rom, sr, AV, G] RIC 76; [An, G] RIC 297; cf. (hybrid) [An, Sa] RIC 33; [Den, G] RIC 361 (Cunetio 1424); also cf. [Rom(?), sr, An, G] RIC 586 (Hunter 187-8; Cunetio 1431-2; cf. above Ch.2, n.52). VICTORIA AETERNA, VICT AET AVG [Med, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 18, (cf. RIC 291). The concept of the emperor's eternal victories was inseparably bound up with the idea of Rome's eternal destiny: see below, Ch.4.c.

32. On Victoria as a goddess in the Roman world, see Weinstock (1958b); on the significance of this observation in the present context, Fears (1981), 740-49.

33. VICT COMES AVG [Tre, AV, P] S.55 (E.-); COMES AVG [Tre, AV, V] S.2-7 (E.685-8); [An, V] Cunetio 2519-21 (cf. RIC 106-7); COMES AVG [Tre, Absch, T] S.10 (E.821); [Tre, An, T] St-Mard 1580-705 (E. 770, 774; cf. Cunetio 2606 = Normanby 1475, obv. from Col!); cf. [An, T2] Cunetio 2612 (St-Mard 2576-94). Note also: VICTORIA AVG (half-length bust of Victoria) [Tre, AV, V] E.666-7 (S.10-12; omitted by Lafaurie (1975), 933); FELICITAS AVG (jugate busts of Vict. and Fel.) [Tre, AV, P] S.108-11 (E.452-3); cf. CONSERVATORES AVG below, n.43. Victoria also appears as the sponsor of the emperor's reign on two Licinian types (PM TRP V COS IIII PP [Vim, Jr, An, V] RIC 231; PM TRP V COS III PP [G]): Göbl (1951), 30.

34. Victoria crowning emp. (rev.): VICTORIA AVG [Ant, Jr+, An, G] Cunetio 1877, cf.1880, 1915 (RIC [Jr!] 450); PM TP C V PP [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 70; FIDES EXERCITVS [Sis, sr, Ag-m, G] Siscia 2 (Fitz/Sis. 44); RESTITVTOR ORBIS [Cyz, An, A] RIC 369 (Maraveille 672, 676; Sirmium 1802-8); VICTORIA AVG [Sis, An, A] RIC 239 (Sirmium 760); VIRTVS POSTVMI SC [Tre, AE, P] E.206 (B.22); VOT PVBL (in biga) [Tre, AV, P] S.30 (E.-; Schulte dates this to 262); VIRTVS AVG (at same time, emp. crowns trophy) [Tre, Absch, V] S.56 (E.- ; Lafaurie (1975), 932). See further App. table A:8.

35. Victoria with vota inscribed on shield (rev.): VOTA DECEN(N)ALIA [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 541 (Cunetio 1532-4; Göbl (1953), 20); QVINQVENNALES POSTVMI AVG (X) [Tre, AV, P] S.83-8 (E.362); S.89 (E.364); QVINQVENNALES POSTVMI AVG (VOT/X), S.79-81 (E.362-3); S.90 (E.364); QVINQVENNALES AVG (V/Q) [Tre, QAV, P] E.374-5 (S.Q9-Q9A); cf. VICTORIA AVG (VOT/X) [Tre, AV, P] RIC 41 (E.-; de Witte, 303b; but cf. Schulte (1983), 172 'a'); PM TRP X COS V PP (VO/XX) [Col, AV, P] E.594 (S.162-3); [Col, An, P] E.595; VOTIS DECENNALIBVS (X) [Tre, QAV, T] E.880 (S.Q1); VICTORIA AVGG (VO/X) [Tre, AV, T] E.879 (Schulte (1983), 173 'd'; Lafaurie (1975), 948, wrongly as "VOT/X").

36. Vota inscribed on shield surrounded by wreath (rev.). VOTIS DECENNALIBVS [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 139 (the original vota decennalia suscepta of AD 253; Göbl (1951), 19, also cites [AE] for both emperors). The vota decennalia soluta (vicennalia suscepta) of AD 262 were coined at two mints. [Rom, sr, G]: VOTIS DECENNALIB(VS); VOTIS X [AAV] Göbl (1953), 14 (RIC 92-3; cf. FID PRAET VOTA X, above, n.2); VOTIS DECENNALIBVS [AEm] Göbl (1953), 17f.; VOTIS DECENNALIB [An] Normanby 102 (cf. RIC 334). [Med, sr, G] VOT(IS) X ET XX [AAV] Göbl (1953), 21 (cf. RIC 94-6, wrongly at Rome); VOTIS DECENNALIBVS [An] Göbl (1953), 20 (cf. RIC 597-9, wrongly at Siscia). As with the "Victoria" types, these "clipeatus" coins were clearly intended for distribution as donatives (the symbolism is the same in both cases).

37. VICTORIA AVG [Rom, Den, A] RIC 71-3 (cf. Maraveille 109). For the arrangement of these coin types see Bastien & Pflaum (1962), 277-81; for the quiquennalian interpretation: Manns (1939), 6; Estiot (1983), 38.

38. VIRTVS types, more or less ubiquitous in both joint and sole reigns, account for a remarkable 30% (456 out of 1523 specimens) of the Cunetio joint reign coins issued at Rome in the name of Gallienus (cf. above, n.24); for the various forms, see below. For Gallienus' invicta virtus, CIL VI 1106 (ILS 548)

[Rome]; cf. [Virtuti?] domini n. Gallieni invicti Aug. qua universum orbem suum defendit ac propagit, ILS 549 [Rome].

39. App. table A:9, nos. 3b [G], 10c-d [P]; table A:10, no. 1a, 3a [G]; table A:11, no. 5a [G]; table A:12, IIb [P]; to these must be added VIRTVS POSTVMI SC [Tre, AE, P] E.206 (B.22) and VIRTVS GALLIENI AVG [Tre, jr, Quat, G] (below, n.42a).

40. See App. table A:10; cf. also table A:6. The trophy was a particularly important symbol in this context (note table A:9, nos. 6-8; table A:10, nos. 6, 7a-e; cf. also table A:11, no.4): see Picard (1957). The intriguing but wayward theory that imperial cuirassed images were intended to represent the emperor as a kind of tropaion empsuchon, put forward by Kantorowicz (1961), 381, cannot be sustained.

41. The identification of Mars, or more probably the emperor as Mars, on the "Virtus" types is made certain by the number of close if not exact parallels with types referring directly to Mars: see App. table A:9, passim (cf. also tables A:6 and A:10). Other types can also be fitted into this scheme, such as VICTORIAE AVGG (as table A:9, no. 1) [Ant, jr, An, V] Cunetio 822 (cf. RIC 225); [G] cf. RIC 300. It is in this confused situation that the pictorial system for designating reverse iconography devised by Göbl comes into its own (see above, Ch2, n.10).

42. [Tre, AV, VI] S.54-5. Only three specimens from a single reverse die survive (now in Luxembourg, Glasgow and Paris; for full references and difficulties concerning these, see above chapter 3.b, note 39). Their rarity and poor condition have led to controversy concerning the identity of the figures in the scene: the traditional description has "two soldiers" attacking "three women" (so RIC and Hunter); most recently Schulte (1983), ad loc., has identified the former pair as Victorinus (with the spear) and "ein Waffenträger" (with the sword), and he regards the enemy they combat as male. The latter suggestion seems likely, though not conclusive; for the other pair, however, I prefer to see the front figure (with sword and shield, (?)laureate) as the emperor and the helmeted figure behind (with spear and shield) as Mars. The helmet worn by this figure closely resembles that discussed above, 3.c at n.81.

42a. The same helmeted figure, this time leading the mounted emperor into battle also appears of a Gallienic type: VIRTVS GALLIENI AVG [Tre, jr, Quat, G] E.72 (Göbl (1951), 33); here again the emperor's

companion, conventionally described as "Virtus", should be understood as Mars.

43. COMES AVG [Col(?), AV, VI]: App. table A:9, no.10a (note that the legend is also strongly associated with Victoria on the coinage of this emperor: above n.33). Jugate busts of the emperor and Mars: [Tre, AV, VI] <obv.> S.10 (E.667); VIRTVTI AVG [Tre, AV, P] <rev.> S.118 (E.432; the features of both Mars (on the rev.) and Hercules (jugate with P. on obv.) closely approximate to those of P. himself). CONSERVATORES AVG (jugate busts of Mars & Victoria) [Tre, AV, P] S.119 (E.437; part of a series of jugate divine types: Schulte's "Group 10"). On the close conflation of the emperor and Mars in obverse iconography see above, Ch.3.c. On imperial divine comites, see Nock (1972) II, 653-75.

44. For the types giving significant epithets to Mars, see App. table A:9, as follows: Propugnator, nos. 2a-b, 3c, 4b, 6c; Pacifer, nos. 4a, 4c-e, 5a-b; Victor, nos. 1e, 7a, 9b; Augustus, no. 1d. For titular reverses, App. table A:9 nos. 7b-7e.

45. App. table A:11, nos. 9a [G]; 9b-c [P]. On the epithet Falerius, see below, Ch.4.c, at n.64. The obverse of some of these Postumianic types (E. 558, 560) are among the antoniniani representing the emperor in the guise of Hercules, in a similar fashion to their Commodian prototypes: [Den, Commodus] BMC V, 343-5; [AE] BMC V, 717. It is evident that Postumus' Herculean self-image, as certain other aspects of his symbolic representation, was carefully modelled on that of the last of the Antonines. On Commodus and Hercules, see also BMC IV 339, 669, 676-7; and Alföldi, A. (1935), 206; Fears (1981), 815.

46. Herculi Aug(usto) consorti D(omini) N(ostri): CIL XI 6308 [Italy] (apparently set up along with the victory inscription, CIL XI 6309; see above, n.31).

47. Of the monographs on Postumus' relationship with Hercules, see esp. Andreotti (1940), on the peculiar cults mentioned on P.'s coinage; Bastien (1958), on the Herculean labours series (Travaux). The identification between P. and Hercules went well beyond the fashion current in the mid-third century (so Bastien (1967), 67f.; but cf. Andreotti (1940), 2) and should probably be regarded as reflecting the emperor's own disposition (Drinkwater (1987), 162); it can thus properly be compared to the special relationship evoked by Commodus (see above, n.45).

48. On the division into "battle-god" and "ideal ruler-god", see Drinkwater (1987), 162-3, following Derichs (1950). I find the argument totally unconvincing. König (1981), 120ff., also noted a shift in the iconographic presentation on the Deusoniensis types towards a more "ideal ruler" complexion, but in practice the iconography of the early types is not exclusively "bellicose" and suggests links with other imperial Herculean ideals: see Bastien (1967), 64ff. (Indeed Drinkwater's tendency to divide most of the reverse types of the western emperors into "warlike" and "peaceful", and his attempts to read a great deal into this division in terms of their policies and actions, is altogether unconvincing.)

49. Postumus obv. Jugate with Hercules: [AV/Absch] S. 108, 108A, 109-10, 112-33, 135-7, 139, 141-3, 147-50, 152-163, Q10-Q14; in addition, [AE] E. 424, 449, 451 (B.133-5). Of the 180 gold and Abschlag types in Schulte's catalogue (excluding the two Milan coins, from antoninianus dies, and the "labours" antoniniani) 54 (30%) have Herculean jugate obverses; another 3 represent P. as Hercules (above, Ch.3.c, nn. 83-4); indeed from early in AD 266 only one obverse type (S.138) fails to link the emperor's authority directly to Hercules in one or other of these ways (for dating, see Schulte (1983), 40ff., 47).

50. COMITI AVG (Jugate P/Herc. r.) [Tre, AV, P] E.427 (S.113); CONSERVATORI AVG (as before, but l.) [AV, P] E.422 (S.114). In these two cases the symbolism is reinforced by the jugate obverses (on the series of jugate types to which these belong, Schulte's "Group 10", S.108-119, see above, n.43). FELICITAS AVG (opposing busts Herc./P.) [Tre, AV, P] E.306 (S.22).

51. HERCVLI COMITI AVG COS III [Tre, AEm, P] E.424 (B.133; Gnecchi III, 116, nos. 7-8); on the authenticity of this piece, see Bastien (1967), 55; for iconography, cf. E.449 (B.134). AETERNITAS AVG (Herc.) [Tre, AV, P] E.128 (S.8).

52. No Herc. types are known for Laelian or Marius, and none for Victorinus (with the exception of two appearances on the legionary series: S.31, S.41; see App. table A:7). The only other western Herculean type, VIRTVTI AVGVSTI [Tre, AV, T] (App. table A:11, no. 1c), which copied the earlier Postumianic and Gallienic types (A:11, no. 1c), was in origin a type coined for Gordian III: RIC IV.3, 95; on the Gallienic type in the Normanby hoard see Bland & Burnett (1987), 124.

53. Deusoniensis: see App. table A:11, nos 1e, 2b-c, 4a (on iconography of this last, see Bastien (1967), 69); in addition, HERC DEVSONIENSI (Temple) [Tre, An, P] E.316 (Cunetio 2409); HERCVLI DEVSONIENSI (Laureate bust of Herc.) [Tre, AV, P] E.325 (S.77); [Absch, P] E.146 (S.5); [AE] B.15-16 (cf. E.183); HERCVLI DEVSONIENSI (half-length bust of Herc. wearing lionskin tied round hid neck, club over shoulder) [Absch, P] E.547 (S.154; Travaux 56-7, cf. 58); note parallel POSTVMVS AVGVSTVS (Similar to prec., but certainly P.) [Absch, P] E.554 (S.155; Travaux 59-60). Magusanus: App. table A:11, no. 1f (B.105 lists just eleven examples; on iconography see Bastien (1967), 67). For the identification of these cults and their location, see below, Ch.5.b.

54. App. table A:12, IIa, IIb. Hercules Invictus was an established cult at Rome.

55. For this remarkable series, see App. table A:12, I. The number of types known only in AE (see Schulte (1983), 41-4, 106-18) has lead some to question whether all types were intended for gold: e.g. Besly (1984), 230f., who overstates his case. To consider this question we must remove from Schulte's group 11a both S.134, S.144-6 (antoninian) and the two final bust types (S.154-5, above n.53, as these really belong in the parallel series, Schulte's group 11b). Of the potentially gold series, 11 specimens are AV, 52 are AE. This remains a low ratio of gold to base-metal it is true. However, only 6 reverse dies, covering five of the labours, have no AV strikes extant, and only 3 of these are never paired with obverses elsewhere struck in gold. These 3 dies account for but 4 coins (out of 63), so that 2 of the labours struck with obverse dies known only in AE (PISAEO and GADITANO) are known from but a single example each. Given the low survival rate of AV compared to AE, the likelihood is strong that gold examples of these once also existed (and may even yet come to light). Given this, as well as the homogeneity of the series and its consistently high quality of die cutting, there can be little doubt that (pace Besly) Schulte is correct to regard the series as being intended for gold. (On the exclusion of the antoninian and the "Abschlag question" generally, see Bland (1988b), 260.)

56. IANO PATRI [Rom, sr, AV, G] RIC 45. Given the relative frequency of references on Gallienus' coinage to Augustan ideology (see below n.86), this explanation does not seem altogether unlikely; see de Blois (1976), 133. On Augustus and the ideology of peace, see below, Ch.7 (esp. nn. 23 and 50).

57. For example: PAX AVGG [Rom, Jr, An, G] RIC 155, 157 (Normanby 21); PAX AVG [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 255-6; [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 505-7; [Sis, sr, AV, G] Siscia 10-11; [QAV] Siscia 9 (cf. 12); [An] Siscia 52-67 (all denominations, cf. Fitz/Sis, 88-121). PAX AVGVSTI [Sis, An, A] RIC 232; [Rom, An, A] RIC 35 (Normanby 1236); RIC 51 (Maravelille 19). PAX AVG [Tre, AV, P] S.156 (RIC 359; E.-); PAX AVGVSTI [An, P] E.300 (Cunetio 2438; see Besly & Bland (1983), 51); PAX AVG P|_ [An, P] E.566 (Cunetio 2453). PAX AVG [Tre, AV, VI] E.678 (RIC 98); but cf. Schulte (1983), 172 'a'. PAX AVG VI* [An] E.651 (Cunetio 2518); E.675; E.682 (Cunetio 2530; cf. variants: 2529, 2531-33, 2538, 2540, 2542-4, 2547). Pax made an especially strong showing for Victorinus: out of a total of 7,198 antoniniani for VI. in the Cunetio hoard, 2,237 (31%) were E.682 (or variants). The marks P|_ and VI* on these coins were perhaps "privy" or "control marks", being derived from the initial letter of the names Postumus and Victorinus respectively (Besly & Bland (1983), 53, 57; Drinkwater (1987), 141, n.54; Bland & Burnett (1988), 147; cf. however Elmer (1941), 61).

58. VBIQVE PAX was issued as part of the GALLIENAE AVGVSTAE series: Göbl (1953), 16 (above, Ch.3, n.89). PM TP COS IIII PP [AV, P] S.107 (E.464; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 916, erroneously as "PM TRP"; note also E.465, rejected by Schulte). TRIB POT X COS V PP [AV, P] E.590 (S.161). TRP II COS PP [AV, T] S.36 (cf. E.807; both Elmer and Lafaurie (1975), 947, erroneously read "PM TRP"). Both the [G] VBIQVE PAX and [P] S.107 were issued alongside VICTORIA AVG types. On the emperor as pacator, see Alföldi, A. (1928), 183ff.; and cf. above Ch.3.b. PAX AETERNA (AVG) [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 252-4. PAX AETERNA [Tre, AV, T] S.9 (E.816; RIC 20); S.37; [Absch, T] S.38 (E.813); on the confusions with these types (cf. de Witte 64; Cohen 90, 92; RIC 19) and the dubiousness of E.814 (de Witte 63), see Schulte (1983), 149, 157 (ad loc.). PAX AETERNA [Med, An, A] RIC 114 (Manns (1939), 17).

59. AVGVSTA IN PACE (empress enthroned as the embodiment of Pax) [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 60 (Cunetio 1535-7); (AVG -) RIC 57, 58 (Cunetio 1711-13, 1725, 1763-6; Normanby 459; for sequence, Besly & Bland (1983), 36). The Christian interpretation suggested by Cesono (1949-51), is not very convincing: for a more straightforward interpretation, as here, see Taeger (1960), 439f.; de Blois (1976), 155; Alföldi, A. (1928), 187. Kuhoff (1979), 56, also suggests these types refer back to Augustus.

60. The elaboration of the SECVRITAS theme is a notable feature of the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus; in

particular we may note SECVRIT PERPET [Tre, Jr, An, V] E. 3, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17; [Med, Jr, An, V] RIC 256 (Cunetio 746-7; Göbl (1951), 34). Also [Rom, sr, An, G]: SECVRIT PERPET, RIC 280 (with variants); SECVRIT ORBIS, RIC 278-9; SECVRIT PVBL, RIC 281. Note also SECVRITAS PERPETVA [AV, T]: S.49 (E.-; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 946); SECVRIT AVG [Rom, An, A] RIC 38 (Normanby 1251).

61. SPES PVBLICA [Tre, AV, P]: E.158 (S.21). SPEI PERPETVAE [Tre, An, P]: E.312.

62. CONCORD AET [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 2; CONCOR(DIA) AET [Sis, Sa] Siscia 2, 4; CONCOR(DIA) AVG [Sis, Sa] Siscia 3, 5. Similarly: CONCORDIA AVG [Rom, An, A] RIC 25 (Normanby 1240); [Rom, AE] RIC 76, 79-81; [Sis, AV] RIC 163-5 (Manns (1939), 28); [Sis, An] RIC 213 (Sirmium 715-21; cf. 722); [Med, An] RIC 119 (Maraveille 121; Sirmium 162); for other concordia types, see below n.72; cf. App. table A:5.

63. SALVS PROVINCIARVM [Tre An, P]: Cunetio 2367-8 (cf. E.117); E.123 (Cunetio 2371-3); SALVS PROV [Tre, AV, P] S.2 (E.-). DACIA FELIX [Med, AV, A] Milan 11 (RIC -); [An] RIC 108 (Normanby 1258). These Dacia types are usually presumed to refer to the evacuation of further Dacia; Estiot (1991), 451-5 (cf. also Manns (1939), 13, 17, 24f.) dates the Dacia type to very early in the reign, suggesting either this is not the case, or else that the evacuation began a little earlier than is usually supposed. Note also PANNONIAE [Med, AV, A] Milan 6 (RIC -); [An] RIC 113; and SALVS ITAL [Med, Jr, An, G] RIC 400.

64. Fallerii, in northern Italy, was especially important for Gallienus, who appears to have taken its name as a sobriquet (on coin types, see App. table A:11, no. 9a, and below, n.105). A large number of inscriptions from the town show the special relationship between that community and Gallienus and Salonina (according him some unsual and noteworthy titles, including redintegrator coloniae Fallscorum): CIL XI 3089-94; AE (1979), 218; AE (1982), 272 (see Ch.3, nn. 50, 55, 101). For communities taking the emperor's name: Colonia Augusta Verona Nova Galliena, CIL V 3329 (ILS 544); C(olonia) C(laudia) A(ra) A(grippinensium) [[Va[le]riana Gallieniana]], CIL XIII 8261 (K.31); Colon(ia) G(alliena) A(ugusta) F(elix) Med(iolana), CIL V 5869 (ILS 6730; Mommsen's redaction remains tentative); Durostorum Aurelianum, CIL III 12456. On this symbolism, see Sherwin-White (1973), 411.

65. Among the qualities and benefits of this kind mentioned on the coinage (too many to enumerate) are

some expressing concrete benefits, e.g. ABVNDANTIA AVG, ANNONA AVG and LIBERALITAS AVG, while others sound a more generally reassuring note, e.g. HILARITAS AVG, LAETITIA AVG and VBERITAS AVG. (The latter category make a prominent showing in the coinage of the western emperors: E. 579, 589-90; Cunetio 2551, 2639; E.846. Note esp. Postumus' LAETITIA AVG (galley) types (S23; E.130; B.80-90) and their various far-fetched interpretations: Elmer (1941), 33; Hiernard (1972), 335f.; König (1981), 93; Schulte (1983), 30; Drinkwater (1987), 168.)

66. GAUDIA PVBLICA (four maidens holding a large cornucopia) [AV, Vl] E.706 (S.49); see Lafaurie (1975), 960 (cf. 934, incorrect legend), for significance and the reference in the iconography to second-century types. The cornucopia is a common device in the iconography of types referring to securitas, concordia, liberalitas, abundantia, etc.

67. FELICITAS AVGG [Rom, Jr, AV/An/AE, V] Gobl (1951), 20-1, 23-4; it was also one of two types produced for Saloninus as Augustus ([Tre, Jr+, AAV/An, Ss] E.114; E.109; see Shiel (1979), 118-9). For the Licinii we also find the legends FELICITAS PVBLICA, TEMPORVM FELICITAS, SAECVLI FELICITAS, FELICITAS SAECVLI (see Göbl (1951), 28-9, 34, 35) and in the sole reign FELICI AET also (Siscia 27-9; cf. Göbl (1953), 15, 24-5). The same range of types is found for the western emperors and for Aurelian. Notable among these are the types: SAECVLI FELICITAS (Emp. with globe and spear) [Tre(?), An, P] E.593 (on where minted, see above Ch.2, n.47); [Cyz, An, A] Normanby 1284 (Maravelle 633; Sirmium 1543-5; Blackmoor 3785, cf. note ad loc.; RIC 352 corr.); FELICITAS POSTVMI AVG (Emp. sacrificing attended by Fel.) [Tre, AE, P] B.134 (E.449); TEMPORVM FELICITAS (Hispania) [Col, AV, L] S.1-4 (E.623; Gilljam (1982), 20): an apparent reference to Hadrian's "provincial" series ([AV, Hadr.] BMC III, 843-5). On types relating Felicitas to Victoria and to Hercules, see also above, nn. 33, 50.

68. SAECVLO FRVGIFERO (Winged caduceus) [An, P] E.381 (Cunetio 2426); [Tre, AE, P] B129-30 (E.378-9); the type harks back to the coinage of Pertinax ([Den, Pert.] BMC V, 5).

69. Types depicting Mercury (with caduceus and purse): FORTVNA REDUX [Ant, jr, An, V] RIC 214 (Cunetio 814); [G] RIC 292 (Cunetio 815); FIDES AVG [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 607 (Hunter 206); PROVIDENTIA AVG [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 653 (Hunter 211); MERCVRIO FELICI [Tre, An, P] E.413 (Cunetio 2419); PROVIDENT AVG [Cyz, An, A] RIC

336 (Manns (1939), 25). Note also the inscription recording the dedication of a statue to Mercury at Rome during Aurelian's third consulship (25 April, 275; conceivably erected on his orders): Bull. Arch. Com. (1882), 151, no. 545 (Homo (1904), 361). See also the Mercury obv. types in Ch3.c, nn. 87-8; see further n.70, below.

70. INTERNVTIVS DEORVM [Tre, An, P] Cunetio 2420 (E.-). The die of this rare antoninianus type may well have been intended for gold to judge by its unusual legend and careful workmanship. The "negotiations" interpretation was offered by Carson (1958), passim, esp. 267f.; but cf. Drinkwater (1987), 172f.; on its placement and denomination, see Besly & Bland (1983), 50f.; Schulte (1983), 38, and Besly (1984), 232. PM TRP VII COS III PP (Emp. sacrificing attended by Mercury) [Tre, AV, P] S.99-100 (E.399-400). On the important relationship between Mercury and the imperial cult, see Combet Farnoux (1981).

71. SPES PVBLICA [Tre, AV, T]: S.4-8 (E.745, 800, 802-3); [Tre, An, T] E.746 (Normanby 1456); E.761 (Cunetio 2581); E.764, 767 (Cunetio 2583, 2585); [Tre, AV, T2] E.872 (S.7-7A; 7A is not E.882 as printed); E.871 (S.11); [Tre, An, T2] E.769 (Cunetio 2608-9; cf. 2610-11). Also SPEI PERPETVAE [AV, T2]: S.10 (E.868; RIC 217; cf. S.9). SPES PVBLICA [Tre, jr, An, Ss] E. 105; [AV] 110; and (obv. IMP SALON VALERIANVS AVG) [Tre, jr+, An] E. 108 (cf. "FELICITAS", above n.67; on [AAV] E. 113, see now Shiel (1979), p.118 n.1).

72. Such dynastic inscriptions are prominent for the Licinii: thus the multiple inscriptions, CIL VIII 2380-83 (K.1-4) [Numidia]; for inscriptions dedicated to several members of the Licinian house at once, see Peachin (1990), 345-63, esp. 353-61. Joint-reign medallions, notably (obv., busts of V/V2) PIETAS AVGVSTORVM, (rev., busts of G/Sa) CONCORDIA AVGVSTORVM: Gnecchi, I, p.53, no. 1 (cf. E.70); for other joint-reign types stressing dynastic lines, see Göbl (1951), 26-7; for similar sole reign types, see RIC V.1, p.191. For A/Sv: CONCORDIA AVGG (Emp. and empress clasping hands) [Rom, An, Sv] RIC 3; [Ser, An, Sv] RIC 16-17 (Estiot (1983), 28); CONCORDIA AVG [Ant, An, Sv] RIC 19. Note also the special bronze double obverse issue: obv. (IMP) AVRELIANVS AVG (radiate bust of A.), rev. SEVERINA AVG (bust of Sv, on crescent) [Rom, AE, A] RIC 1-3 (p.313; cf. Cohen 1-3; Gnecchi III, p.65, nos. 1-2); also RIC 4 (laureate/no crescent).

73. Joint obv. [AV, T]: IMP C TETRICVS PF AVG (Jugate T/T2) E.855-6 (S.57; cf. Schulte (1983), 173 'b');

IMPP TETRICI AVGG (Opposing busts, T/T2) S.59-60 (cf. E.877-8; note rev. below); IMPP TETRICI PII AVGG (Jugate T/T2) [AV, T] E.858 (S.56), E.859 (cf. Schulte (1983), 173 'c'), E.866 (S.58), E.879 (cf. Schulte (1983), 173 'd'). This last obv. style imitates one for Septimius and Caracalla (BMC V, 244-5; cf. Ch.3, n.27). Joint rev. [AV, T]: PM TRP II COS PP (Two mounted figures - almost certainly T & T2) E.808 (S.32); PM TRP II COS PP (T sacrificing at altar, behind attended by T2 [?] with palm) S.40 (E.-); PM TRP COS III PP VOT X (T & T2 sacrificing at altar) S.59-61 (cf. E.876-8; note obv. above). NOBILITAS AVGG [Col, AV, T] E.843 (S.69); [An, T] E.795; [Col, An, T2] Cunetio 2656 (Normanby 1537; E.-). In view of the AV, Elmer considered the type "belonged" to T (T2 as hybrid); but the type refers back to coins minted under Septimius for Geta Caesar, with the same dynastic connotations (BMC V [Den, Geta] 223-7; [QAV] 457). In view of the Geta parallel, I prefer to see T2 as the primary type (cf. his title nobilissimus Caesar, above Ch.3.d); see Besly & Bland (1983), 65.

74. AETERNITATI AVGG (Saturn) [Ant, jr, An, V] RIC 210; [G] 289; AETERNITAS AVG (Saturn) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 606 (cf. 554). The reign of Saturn was considered a "Golden Age" (these types therefore recall the symbolism of FELICITAS SAECVLI etc.).

75. App. table A:13, nos. 1-2. For the wolf-and-twins iconography, see also the legionary series (table 4:1: LEG II ITAL VI(I)P VI(I)F, RIC 329-30); the SALVS VRBIS with this iconography [Vim, jr, AE, V2] cited in Göbl (1951), 29, is wanting confirmation. The Mars/Rhea Silvia type (table A:13, no.2) follows a type for Antoninus Pius (TRIB POT COS III: BMC IV [AV] 253; [AE] 1307); Göbl (1951), 34, suggests the die was intended for AV. These allusions recall the emphasis placed on the symbolic representation of the emperor as father of his country and (re-)founder of the state or the community that we have seen elsewhere (see above, n.64; and see further Ch.7.d below).

76. VESTA [Rom, jr, AV, Sa] RIC 14; [An, Sa] RIC 39 (cf. 38; Hunter 1-2); [Tre, jr, An, Sa] E. 62; [Vim, jr, AV/An, Sa] Göbl (1951), 29 ([An] RIC 69); [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 32 (Cunetio 987-9); cf.Cunetio 996 (RIC 68; on rearrangement of Vesta types see Besly & Bland (1983), 26, 28); [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 68 (Cunetio 1682); [Sis, sr, An, Sa] Normanby 531 (see Bland & Burnett (1988), 125). VESTA FELIX [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 69 (Cunetio 1683-6; Hunter 26). VESTA AETERNA [Ant, jr, An, Sa] RIC 71 (Syria D 40; cf. 70, and see Robertson (1978), xlix-l, substituting paladium for "victory"). On the significant relationship between

Vesta (as the keeper of Rome's eternal flame) and Roma Aeterna in the context of imperial ideology, see Mellor (1981), 1020ff.; Nock (1972) I, 252ff.

77. App. table A:13. The ROMA types of this period were predominantly, though not exclusively, the product of eastern mints; it is important, however, to note their appearance at the Gallic mint in the joint reign, in view of the subsequent use made of this symbolism for the western emperors. On [AV, P] S.47-53A (App. table A:13, no. 6a), Schulte suggests the objects Roma carries are a long sceptre and a trophy, but he is clearly in error: the spear and the palladium are more obvious attributes of Roma, and after close inspection of the specimen in the BM, I feel there can be no doubt that this latter reading is correct.

78. Schulte expresses some doubt as to the identity of this female figure ([P] S.97; App. table A:13, no. 16a), but the seated posture and inverted spear are characteristic of Roma as are the "Amazon"-style drapery, off the shoulder: see Mellor (1981).

79. For these four "Virtus" types, see App. table A:13, nos. 8-10 [T], cf. no.13 [G]. The identificaton of Roma in the icongraphy of Tetricus' types is controversial: A:13, no.8a (S.20-23), see remarks above, n.78 (on the symbolism of the olive branch, see below); A:13, no.9a (E.780) is very common (Normanby 1485, lists 1,038 specimens out of a total of 16,192 coins for Tetricus), but not until the publication of the Normanby hoard has the type been referred to as "Roma"; A:13, no.10a (S.48), pace Elmer and Schulte, the figure is clearly Roma; indeed the type closely follows one minted for Galba with the legend ROMA VICTRIX (Roma sdg with olive branch) RIC I (2nd ed.), [Galba] 44. The designation "Virtus" usually given for all these three types, unsatisfactory in general (see above, Ch.4.b), is doubly so in these instances, since the link with Rome is thereby lost.

80. On Hadrian's temple and the connection between the emperor, Roma and Venus, see Mellor (1981), 1020-24; on the festival of the Romaia, see also Athenaeus, 8.361 e-f. On Augustan symbolism of Romulus and Venus in the Forum of Augustus, see below, Ch.7.d, esp. n.51.

81. The usual type for VENVS GENETRIX shows the goddess with a young boy (usually taken to be Cupid, though it could perhaps be Iulus; in any case, the two were not so different: cf. Aeneid I.657ff.): e.g., minted intermittently over a considerable period, [Rom, Jr,

An, Sa] Göbl (1951), 25; [Rom, sr, An, Sa] Göbl (1953), 12f., 16 (RIC 30).

82. VENVS VICTRIX [Tre, Jr, An, Sa] E.61, 98; [AV, Sa] E.101; [Ant, Jr, An, V] RIC 222 (cf. [G] Göbl (1951), 35); [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 31 (add Normanby 300); [Rom, sr, An, G] (hybrid) RIC 289 (Normanby 281-2); [Sis, sr, An, Sa] Siscia 13; VENVS VICT [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 66; VENER VICTRICI [Ant, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 29. Note also: PROVIDENT AVG (Venus with spear, shield and helmet, much as the Licinian Venus Victrix) [Cyz, An, A] RIC 335 (cf. Manns (1939), 18, wrongly suggesting Minerva).

83. Again Venus is often depicted with a small child (probably Cupid, but cf. above n.81) VENVS FELIX [Tre, Jr, An, Sa] E. 60 (RIC 7); [AV] RIC 3 (cf. E.10); [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 65 (Cunetio 1590). VENVS FELIX [Rom, Den, Sv] RIC 6 (cf. Bastien & Pflaum (1962), 277-81 for arrangement).

84. CERERI AVG [Ant, sr, An, Sa] RIC 90 (cf. the link between Gallienus and Ceres/Demeter, above, Ch.3.c, nn. 89-90). DEAE SEGETIAE [Tre, Jr, An, Sa] E.96; [AV, Sa] E.99; cf. in the same issue: DEO VOLKANO [Tre, Jr, An, V] E.74; [AV, V] E.77; DEO MARTI [Tre, Jr, An, G] E.80, 85; [AV, G] E.90. In each case, these three parallel types depict a statue of the relevant deity inside a tetrastyle temple; whether these refer to the dedication of three new temples to these deities cannot be substantiated, but is on the whole not likely.

85. FECVNDITAS AVG [Med, Jr-sr, An, Sa] RIC (Jr) 57; this type was issued over a period of several years, spanning the period of Valerian's capture (Besly & Bland (1983), 32, 36), so that its meaning may be more prognostic than commemorative (but on the birth of Marinianus see below, n.105). Note also FECVNDITAS AVG SC [Rom, Jr(?), AE, Sa] RIC 45. There is an obvious link between this symbolism and that which linked the empress to Venus Genetrix (see n.81 above). PVDICITIA [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 24-5 (Cunetio 990-1, 1108-11, 1146-7; on order of issue see Besly & Bland (1983), 26, 28). Note also the type PIETAS AVGG (empress/Pietas with children) [Rom, Jr, An, Sa] RIC 35 (Hunter 9-10; cf. [other denom.]: RIC 41, 47, 54, 23; Hunter 11, 17-19).

86. Unfortunately the references for the DEO AVGVSTO type(s) are very confused: most scholars agree two types were produced in the sole reign for Gallienus, one at Rome, one at Siscia: RIC 9, listed under [Rom, sr, AVm, G] (but cf. p.131, note 1, where he states it

is in fact an aureus) appears to correspond to Gnecchi I, 6, no.4 and to Göbl (1953), 16 [cited as AV]; RIC 28 listed as [Rom, sr, AV], cites Cohen 148, and both in turn are cited by Fitz/Sis 30 [Sis, sr, "Medallion"], who also cites both Göbl (1953), 25 [Sis, sr, AV] and Alföldi (Siscia 1 [Sis, sr, AEm]) cf. Fitz (1981-2), 31, nn.18-19. This type refers back to the issue by Trajan Decius honouring a selection of imperial divi, Divus Augustus among them (RIC IV.3, [An, Decius] 77-8, cf. pp. 130-33, for the "Divus" series in general); the distinction of the title deus is a Gallienic innovation. On Gallienus' references back to Augustus, and these types in particular, see de Blois (1976), 129f.; Kuhoff (1979), 56; Alföldi, A. (1928), 197-200 [=(1967), 52-4]. In this context, note also the reference to the cult most inexorably associated with Augustus: APOLLINI PAL [Cyz, sr, An, G] Göbl (1953), 30 (cf. the work of Zanker, cited above Ch.1 n.23). Also note the reference to Trajan, and indeed others, on the coin type SPQR/OPTIMO/PRINCIPI, above, Ch.3, n.51.

87. On the DIVO CLAVDIO coinage see above, Ch.2.c, n.55; on the DIVO VICTORINO PIO coinage, above, Ch.3 n.61; on the consecration issues for members of the Licinian house, see below n.106.

88. Imperial pietas was a common theme on the coinage of the joint reign. The types usually refer to sacrifice (cf. following note): e.g. PIETAS AVGG [Rom, jr, An, Sa] RIC 34 (Cunetio 654); [Ant, jr, An, V] RIC 284-5; [G] RIC 446-7. PIETAS AVG [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 22 (Cunetio 1106-7); [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 505-7; [Sis, sr, An, Sa] Siscia 10. PIETAS AVG [Tre, An, P] E.395 (Cunetio 2428); [AV, P] E.393 (S.106); [Col, An, V] E.741-2 (cf. Cunetio 2571, cf 2572). PIETAS AVG [Med, An, A] RIC 138 (Maraveille 127; 166-7, 201; 248-59; Sirmium 163-4; 202-9; 311-26). On the title Pius and other elements in the ideology of imperial pietas, see above, Ch.3. nn. 1 & 70.

89. PIETAS AVGG (sacrificial implements) [Rom, jr, An, V2] RIC 20; [Rom, Ss] RIC 26; [Tre, An, V2] E. 64, 66, 67b; [Tre, An, Ss] 69. PIETAS AVG <sic> (sacrificial implements) [Tre, jr(jr+?), An, Ss] E. 107; [AV/AAV] 112, 116. PIETAS AVGVSTOR/PIETAS AVGG (sacrificial implements) [An, T2] E.773, 777-8; Cohen 48 (Cunetio 2588-98; Normanby 1540-54; see Besly & Bland (1983), 65, placing these coins at both mints).

90. SALVS AVG(G) (Salus with snake): e.g. [Rom, jr, An/AE, V/G] Göbl (1951), 20; [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 274a; [Tre, An, P] E.301 (Cunetio 2392-3); [AVQ, V] E.736 (S.Q2); [An, V] E. 697, 703, 732-5; [AV, T]

S.62-3 (cf. E.844); [An, T] E. 779, 788. SALVS POSTVMI AVG (Salus with snake) [AVQ, P] S.Q13; [An, P] E.414 (Cunetio 2423). Note the common epigraphic formula pro salute (and its equivalents).

91. SALVS AVG (Aescul.) [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 511-511a (and variants, cf. Cunetio 1687ff.). SALVS POSTVMI AVG (Aescul. and Salus) [Tre, AV, P] S103-4 (E.403-4; note special obvv.); for others of this kind, see above Ch.4.a, n.12. CONSERVATOR AVG (Aescul.) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 632; [Cyz, sr, An, G] RIC 632. CONSERVATOR AVG (Aescul.) [Ser, An, A] RIC 258. Also SALVS AVG (Apollo) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 610. APOLL SALVTARI [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 76. (See below, n.113, for Apollo as conservator.)

92. MINERVA AVG [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 651; [Cyz, sr, An, G] RIC 651; [Sa] (hybrid?) Göbl (1953), 31. PM TRP VII COS PP (Minerva) [Sis, sr, An, G] Fitz/Sis, 128 (cf. Siscia 72). MINER FAVTR [Tre, AV, P] E.309 (S.41-2); [An, P] E.313 (Cunetio 2396-7). MINERVA AVG [Cyz, An, A] RIC 334 (Sirmium 1538).

93. PM TRP XV PP (VIIC in exergue; Neptune) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 603 (Göbl (1953), 29). PM TRP VIIII COS IIII PP (Serapis) [Rom, sr, Absch, G] RIC 19; PM TRP XII COS V PP (Serapis) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 600. NEPTVNO REDVCI [Tre, An, P] E.314 (Cunetio 2398); NEPTVNO COMITI [AV, P] E.310 (S.32-5). SERAPI COMITI AVG [An, P] E.382-3 (Cunetio 2421, 2437; cf. Lafaurie (1975), 921); [AV, P] E.377 (S.105). On the dates of these Postumianic types see Besly & Bland (1983), 56; Schulte (1983), 37-40, places the Seraplc AV types too early: see Besly (1984), 229-31). PM TRP PP COS (Neptune) [Cyz, An, A] RIC 324 (Manns (1939), 20).

94. CASTOR [Tre, An, P] E.589; [Absch, P] E.583 (S.160; Cohen 10). The type is known for certain only in base metal, but note [AV, P] RIC 259 (E.-; Cohen 9; cf. S.160n.: "sehr fräglich, aber nicht unmöglich"). The date of issue would roughly have coincided with Aureolus' revolt in Milan (first half of 268): Schulte (1983), 41-4. Castor was associated with horses (whence the epithet Leukopolos) and it is conceivable that the type was intended to honour the cavalry, even perhaps that stationed at Milan which had apparently come out in favour of Postumus. The Dioscuri were also associated with distress at sea (Pliny NH 2.101; Catul. Carm. 4.27); also, in one version of the myth, the Dioscuri earned their immortality (Horace Carm. 3.3.9). On the difficulties of interpreting this type, see Schulte (1983), 42.

95. IOVI STATORI [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 95; [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 644-5 (cf. Normanby 578; on the importance of this coin for the date of this issue, see above Chapter 2.c, n.39); (IOVIS STATOR) [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 216 (rarely 217-8); [AV] RIC 49. IOVI PATRI [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 642. (For IO CANTAB see below, Ch.5.b and n.19). IOVI STATORI [An, P] E.562, 563 (cf. Cunetio 2449). IOVI STATORI [Cyz, An, A] RIC 333 (Manns (1939), 18); [Ser, An, A] RIC 267 (and variants; Estiot (1983), 27); RIC 268 (Manns (1939), 30).

96. PM TRP II COS II PP (Jupiter) [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 141. Note also the Jovian representation of PM TRP XVI COS VII (Emp. with globe and long sceptre) [Sis, sr, An, G] Fitz/Sis, 130-31 (cf. Siscia 74-5). Also in this vein, cf. PACATOR ORBIS and RECTOR ORBIS, above Ch.3, nn. 43, 55; cf. below n.100.

97. For the Licinii, there appear numerous versions of types bearing (a variant of) the legend IOVI CONSERVATORI, e.g.: [Rom, jr, An, V] RIC 92-4; [G (hybrid?)] RIC 143; [Rom, sr, An, G] 210, (cf. 208); [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 486-7. Note especially, [Ant jr+, An, G] (Jupiter handing the emp. a globe) RIC (jr) 440 (cf. below, n.98 and see App. table A:14). For the western emperors: IOVI CONSERVAT [Tre, An, P] E.388; IOVI CONSERVATORI [Tre, AV, T] E.830 (S.17). Also CONSERVATORI AVG (Jupiter enthroned with thunderbolt and victory) [Tre, AV, P] E.386 (Schulte (1983), 172 'g' and 'h'); (jugate busts: P./Jupiter) S.114 (E.422; Lafaurie (1975), 915, confuses with E.386). Obv. (jugate busts: Vi./Jupiter) [Tre, AV, Vi] S.55-6 (revv. DEFENSOR ORBIS and VIRTVS AVG).

98. On Jupiter as the guarantor of imperial rule, and the significance of Jovian investiture in particular, see Fears (1977), 193ff.; cf. 29ff., 135f., 228ff., 247, 260ff., 267ff.; and (with specific respect to these coins) 281-5. See also above, Ch.3, n.86. The episode in which Aurelian declares his divine right in defiance of a military mutiny: Petrus Patricius FGH IV 197, fr.10.6. The passage also reaffirms the significance of the purple as a mark of absolute and divinely ordained authority (see above Ch.3, n.65).

99. IOVI PROPVGNAT(ORI) [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 46; [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 214. For IOVI VICTORI, see following note. IOVI PROPVGNAT(ORI) [Tre, An, P] E.289-90 (Cunetio 2401-2). IOVI VICTORI (CIA) [Col, An, P] E.570-71 (Cunetio 2467-8). IOVI VICTORI (Jupiter enthroned holding victory and sceptre) [Tre, AV, T] E.842 (S.47); (As previous; with obv. IMPP TETRICI PII AVG) E.859 (RIC 209; Schulte (1983), 173 'c'; cf.

Lafaurie (1975), 948). IOVI VICTORI [Rom, An, A] RIC 49 (Manns (1939), 42, cf. 43). Note also [Cyz, An, A] RIC 229 (unconfirmed).

100. GALLIENVS CVM EXER SVO [Tre, jr, An, V] E. 1, 4, 7, 10, 12a, 15; and the parallel IOVI VICTORI [Tre, jr, An, G] E. 17, 24, 31, 38, 45, 52, 59a. (The pair were both minted over a considerable period at the same officina, along with FIDES MILITVM: see above n.4.) See Göbl (1951), 30-33. On symbolism, see references in nn. 97-8 above.

101. IOVI VLTORI [Rom, sr, An, G] 220-21; for the revenge theory, see Kuhoff (1979), 51.

102. CIL VIII 2626 [Numidia]; CIL III 12456 (restored).

103. IOM SPONSORI SAECVLI AVG [Tre, AE, P] E.387 (B.131). On the authenticity of this coin, its relation to the Commodian prototype and the substitution of SAECVLI for the original SEC(uritatis), see Bastien (1967), 55-7. I.O.M. is specifically invoked on two imperial inscriptions for Postumus RIB 1883, 1886 (K.59-60) [Brit.].

104. AETERNIT(AS) AVGG (Jupiter) [Vim, Jr, AV, V/G] Göbl (1951), 28.

105. IOVI CRESCENTI (Amalthea with infant Jupiter) [Rom, Jr, An, V2] RIC 14; [Vim, An, V2] RIC 13; [Tre, An, V2] E.63, 65, 67a; [Tre, AV, V2] Göbl (1951), 31. LAETIT TEMP and PIETAS SAECVLI (As above) [Vim, jr, An, G], Göbl (1951), 29. PIETAS FALERI (As above; obv.: CONCORDIA AVGG, facing busts of G/Sa) [Rom(Med?), sr, ARm] Gnecchi I (p.54), 1 (cf. Göbl (1953), 19). On Marinianus, see Alföldi, A. (1929), 266f. On "Falerius", see above n.64. For other references to the "Golden Age" on the coinage of the Licinii, see above, Ch.4.c.

106. The DIVO CAES VALERIANO coinage: CONSECRATIO [Rom, Jr, An, V2] (eagle) RIC 27 (Cunetio 683-8; cf. 690; note also, with "altar" rev., RIC 24-5; Cunetio 677-82); CONSACRATIO <sic> (eagle) [Tre, Jr, An, V2] E.68, 104. The DIVA MARININA coinage: CONSECRATIO (peacock) [Rom, jr, AV, Ma] RIC 1-2; [An] RIC 3-4 (Cunetio 624-50).

107. IVNO REGINA [Rom, Jr, An, Sa] RIC 29, 30; [Vim, Jr, An] RIC 58; [Sam, Jr, An] RIC 64; [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 30; [Sis, sr, An] Siscia 7 (cf. 8); [Ant, sr, An] RIC 92 (cf. Göbl (1953), 27f.). IVNO REGINA was, numerically, the most important reverse type for Salonina (of the 2347 [sr, Sa] specimens found at

Cunetio, 1785 (76%) were of this type). IVNO AVG [Med, sr, An, Sa] RIC 62. IVNO VICTRIX [Rom, jr, An, Sa] RIC 31 (Cunetio 652). IVNO REGINA (Juno with peacock) [Rom, AE, Sv] RIC 7 (Gnecchi III (p.66), 1; Cohen 9). (The legend is also thought by some to have been minted at Sis: RIC 15 (with peacock); RIC 14 (Cohen 10; without peacock); but these types were rejected by Rohde. The cult of Juno Regina, whose temple was on the Aventine, was closely associated with the idea of victory.

108. IVNO CONSERVAT [Rom, sr, An, Sa] RIC 11 (except with peacock; cf. 12); IOVI CONSERVAT [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 210: both types were minted simultaneously at officina N (Juno also at offic. H; see Göbl (1953), 16).

109. [Rom, sr, An, G] Cunetio 1336-1421; Göbl (1953), 17). On the iconography, see "The Animals on the 'Cons Aug' Coins of Gallienus", by Ian Carradice, in Besly & Bland (1983), 188-94 (= "Appendix 5"); on the date see Cope (1974), 124f.; King, C. (1982), 469-71. On the interpretation: see now Weigel (1990), highlighting the religious connotations and taking particular account of the religious games associated with these deities; de Blois (1976), 161-9 offers a more straightforward (but less satisfactory) militaristic interpretation; see also Taeger (1960), 439; Kuhoff (1979), 58. On the idea of divine support of this kind in relation to Gallienus, see Alföldi, A. (1967), 49-52; in the Roman empire more generally, see Nock (1972) II, 653-75; Ensslin (1943).

110. [Sis, sr, An, G] APOLLINI CON AVG Siscia 19 (Fitz/Sis 28; cf. RIC 558); DIANAE CONS AVG Siscia 21 (Fitz/Sis 31); LIBERO P CONS AVG Siscia 48 (Fitz/Sis 80; RIC 574); NEPTVNO CONS AVG Siscia 50 (Fitz/Sis 85). These coins were overlooked by Göbl and by Cohen. Why only these four types should have been minted at Siscia remains a mystery; it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that others may yet turn up (indeed cf. the solar type RIC 583).

111. See Carradice's analysis (above, n.109). For Diana in particular there was a large number and variety minted in the series: thus, Cunetio 1344-7, 1354, 1357-66, 1396-1403, 1408-17.

112. RELIGIO AVGG [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 114-15. DIANA FELIX [Med, Jr, An, G] RIC 380 (cf. Göbl (1951), 34); [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 473 (see Besly & Bland (1983), 32.

113. CONSERVAT AVGG (Apollo) [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 83-4; [G(hybrid?)] Cunetio 630 (RIC -). CONSERVAT AVGG

(Apollo and Diana) [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 85. APOLINI CONSERVA [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 71-2; [G(hybrid?)] RIC 125-6 (cf. Cunetio 550, 573, 603); APOLLO CONSER(VA) [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 467-8. (See also above, n.91.) APOLINI PROPVG [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 74-5; [G(hybrid?)] RIC 128. Note also APOLLINI PAL, above n.86.

114. APOLLINI CONS [Rom, An] RIC 22 (Normanby 1245; cf. RIC 21); [Sis, AAV] RIC 160-2 (Cohen 11-13; Manns (1939), 19). APOL CONS AVG (Apollo (or possibly Sol-Apollo) hands emp. a globe, with captive) [Sis, An] RIC 243 (Rohde 67; the iconography is almost identical to the Sol investiture types: cf. App. table A:16). PM TRP COS (Apollo seated with branch; for iconogr. cf. APOLLINI CONS RIC 162 above) [Sis, An] RIC 157 (Manns (1939), 19).

115. Ceremonial torch-bearing was part of the light imagery associated with imperial authority: see Alföldi, A. (1934), 111-18. DIANA LVCIFERA (Diana with torch): [Ant, jr, An, V] RIC 212; [G] RIC 290 (cf. the related type FELICITAS SAECVLI (Victoria(?) with torch) [Ant, jr, An, V] RIC 213; [G] RIC 291). DIANA LVCIFERA (with torch) [Sis, sr, An, Sa] Siscia 6. LVNA LVCIFERA (with torch): [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 646; LVNA LVCIF (in biga): [Sis, sr, An, Sa] Siscia 9. DIANAE LVCIFER(A)E [Tre, An, P] E.396-7 (Cunetio 2430-31).

116. DIANAE REDVCI [Tre, An, P] E.398 (Cunetio 2429). ADIVTRIX AVG [Tre, Quat, Vi] E.668 (Lafaurie (1975), 932); [AV, Vi] S.13-15 (cf. E.661-3); [QAV, Vi] E.669 (S.Q1). VOTA AVGVSTI (Opposing busts of Apollo & Diana) [Tre, AV, Vi] E.670 (S.27); cf. Roma & Diana, App. table A:13, no.12. CONSERVATORES AVG (Jugate busts of Apollo and Diana) [Tre, AV, P] S.112 (E.442).

117. On the origins of the various cults of Sol and their development in the third century, see Halsberghe (1972), 26ff.; Halsberghe (1984); Kantorowicz (1963), 120ff. Sol Invictus was particularly favoured by Septimius and Elagabalus. See further bibliography cited above in Ch.3, n.91.

118. SOLI INVICTO [Ant, sr, An, G] (Sol/globe) RIC 611; (Sol/whip) RIC 658 (see Göbl (1953), 29). ORIENS AVGG [Rom, Jr, An, V] (both whip and globe types attested) RIC 106-7 (Cunetio 481-5, 520-21; cf. [G] Normanby 31, RIC -); [Tre, Jr An, V] E. 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 75; [AV] E.79. ORIENS AVG [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 249 (Cunetio 1230-36, Normanby 230-37); [Med, sr, An, G] (both whip and globe types attested) RIC 494-5 (Cunetio 1617, 1620-21, 1623; cf. 1635 and Normanby 427; cf. also [AV] Göbl (1953), 20-21); [Sis, sr, An,

G] Siscia 51. The legend ORIENS AVG(G) was very well attested during the Licinian period; note esp. the output of this type for Valerian at Rome in the Cunetio hoard (almost 20% of the specimens for V at Rome).

119. PM TRP IIII COS III PP (Sol/whip, no cloak) [Rom, Jr, An, V] RIC 142-142a. RESTITVT GENER HVMANI (Emp as Sol, radiate with globe and cloak): see above, Ch.3 n.35. AETERNITAS AVGG (As above) [Ant, jr, AAV, V] and [G] Göbl (1951), 37; cf. AETERNITATI AVGG [Ant, Jr, An, V] RIC 211; AETERNITAS AVG [Rom, sr, An, G] RIC 160 (Cunetio 1169-75); AETERNITATI AVG [Rom, sr, An, G] Cunetio 1176; [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 630; AETERN AVG(VST) [Med, sr, An, G] RIC 465a (cf. Villaronga (1987), 120, nos.103-8). For other aspects of Gallienus' relationship with Sol, including the colossal statue he supposedly intended, see above Ch.3, n.91.

120. ORIENS AVG (Sol/quadriga to l.) [Tre, AV, P] S.18A (E.-); [AE, P] RIC 152 (B.5; E.-; a type referring back to Caracalla). ORIENS AVG (P|) (Sol/whip) [An, P] E.568-9 (Cunetio 2451; 2454; cf. Normanby 1344). ORIENS AVG (Sol/whip) [Tre, An, V] RIC 115 (Cunetio 2526-7: could be hybrid with [P] E.569 above, cf. Besly & Bland (1983) n. ad loc; also cf. [Tre, jr, An, V] ORIENS AVGG (E.2 etc.) above). INVICTVS (Sol/whip) [Tre, AV, V] E.679 (S.9); [An, V] E.652 (cf Cunetio 2524); (INVICTVS *|) E.653 (Cunetio 2523); E.676 (Cunetio 2528); E.683 (and var., cf. Cunetio 2534-7, 2539, 2541, 2545-6, 2548; Normanby 1416). On the symbol in the ground of some of these E.683 type coins, see Bland (1979), 66; Besly & Bland (1983), 62; appearently recanted in Bland & Burnett (1988), 15 (sv. "Sol 3c").

121. INVICTVS (Bust of Sol) [Tre, AV, V] E.680 (S.8). Obv. (Jugate V/Sol): E.712 (S.30); E.722 (S.40); E.728 (S.46); cf. the legionary issue, App. table A:7. For PACATOR ORBIS [An, P] see above Ch.3, n.43. AETERNITAS AVG (Triple bust of Sol) [Tre, AV, P] E.141 (S.18); E.143 (S.16-17). CLARITAS AVG (Jugate busts of Sol, radiate, and Luna, with crescent on brow) [AV, P] E.547 (S.115-17); cf. S.112. Note also the obv. types for P with solar rays, above 3.c, n.92, cf. n.93.

122. AETERNITAS AVG (Sol/globe) [Rom, An, A] RIC 20 (Normanby 1246-7; type held over from the previous reign). Earlier than the main series of "Oriens" types: ORIENS AVG (Sol/globe) [Byz, An] RIC 397 (Sirmium 1208; for date see Estiot (1983), 29);

(Sol/whip + 2 capt.) [Sis, An] RIC 230 (Maravelle 450; date, Estiot (1983), 24).

123. The antoninianus "Oriens" types are extremely complex, due to subtle differences of iconography and mint mark; the evidence is laid out in the App. table A:15. To these may be added the following [AV/AE] types: ORIENS AVG (Sol/globe + 2 capt.) --//I.L [Sis(?), AV, A] RIC 187 (cf. 18; and Manns (1939), 49); (Sol/globe) --//I.L [Sis(?), AV] RIC 188 (cf. 17; and [(Absch?)] Gnecchi III (p.65), 17); (Sol/quaqdriga to r.) [Ser, Absch] Manns (1939), 44 (RIC -); (Sol/globe) [Ser, QAV] Manns (1939), 56 (RIC -); [Rom, Den] RIC 67 (Rohde 419; Cohen 139). The legend (somewhat ironically) had not made much of an impression in the eastern mints under the Licinii either (cf. above, n.118). The only legend that comes near to rivalling ORIENS AVG under Aurelian is RETITVT(OR) ORBIS (see App. table A:3).

124. The evidence is laid out in App. table A:16; in addition, note the following unconfirmed types cited by Webb: SOLI INVICTO [Ser, An] RIC 309-10.

125. For types depicting Sol as Aurelian's protector and sponsor, see App. table A:16. There is a good deal of confusion over the titular reverse types for Aurelian (inspired in part by the odd, indeed sometimes impossible, numberings; cf. App. table 9, no.8). Note also the titular types with a radiate lion, a beast strongly associated with Sol: PM TRP COS PP (Radiate lion) [Sis, AV] RIC 158-9 (Manns (1939), 19; cf. 20); PM TRP COS [Cyz, AV] RIC 325 (Manns (1939), 20). Note also for Gallienus, PM TRP XII COS VI PP (Radiate lion) [Ant, sr, An, G] RIC 601. Sol is invoked as the emperor's protector in the inscription: App. table A:4, no.2; cf. CIL VIII 23924 (Sotgiu 12; restored) [Africa Procos.].

126. PACATOR ORBIS (Sol/whip) [Lug, An, A], above, Ch.3, n.44 (cf. n.43, for Postumus and Sol). CONCORDIA AVG (Emp. and empress clasping hands; bust of Sol in field) [Rom, AE, A] Manns (1939), 52 (cf.RIC 75-6, 79-81; dated by Manns to the period of the triumph); cf. the Sol/Luna cuirass cited above in Ch.3, n.91.

127. The evidence for types depicting Sol as assisting (presiding over?) other deities in their tutelary functions is set out in App. table A:16, nos 8, 10, 11. In this way their help was seen to be an extension of Sol's overall protection and assistance. For the idea that this represents a movement towards solar monotheism, Fears (1977), 285; cf. below n.133. On the types depicting solar investiture, see Fears

(1977), 286ff. Moreover, by the substitution of one of these gods for Aurelian, these types heighten the sense in which the emperor was perceived as being himself godlike. For another possible example, see below n.130.

128. The female figure has been variously identified as Providentia or Fides. It appears fairly certain however that the legend applies, not to the female figure, but to the scene as a whole. The female figure certainly represents the allegiance of the army, whether she was intended to be Fides or (perhaps more likely) Concordia is of secondary importance. See App. table A:1, nos. 2-3. On the idea of postumous production, see above Ch.2.c, n.58. The same notion of divine sponsorship probably lies (more indirectly) behind the legend PROVIDENTIA AVG: [Rom, An. A] RIC 36 (Normanby 1243; cf. RIC 37); [Rom, D, A] RIC 68-9 (see Bastien & Pflaum (1962), 277-81); also perhaps [Ser, An, A] RIC 286 (unconfirmed). On providentia generally see Berlinger (1935), 80-86; for connection with divine sponsorship, Fears (1977), esp. 244ff., 254f., 270-77, 288f., 299; Nock (1972), I, 264f.

129. For the solar "Restitutor" types, see App. table 16, nos. 2b, 7b, 9c; for the date of the coins from Cyzicus, derived from the mint mark, *C*, see Estiot (1983), 31; cf. [Sis, AV; Ser, AV] Manns (1939), 56.

130. There is no explicit reference to evocatio, but something like it is implied in Aurelian's actions vis-a-vis Sol in the east: see SHA Aur 25.4-6; 28.5; Zos. I, 61.2. On the possibility of syncretism between Jupiter and Sol (or Jupiter and Bel), as one aspect of this problem: Winkler (1958); Will (1959); Straub (1972); cf. Homo (1904), 190. The solar type IOVI CONSER(VATORI) (Emp. receiving globe from Sol/whip) [Ser, An, A] RIC 274-5 (Rohde 189), is suspicious, and lacks recent confirmation: it may have been a die cutter's error or an error of Rohde's decipherment (i.e. that "SOLI CONSERVATORI" was the intended or actual legend of the type). In any case it cannot be used as evidence of syncretism between Jupiter and Sol. On the temple itself and its dedication, Kähler (1937); cf. Zosimus I.61.

131. On Aurelian's religious policy towards Sol in these three respects, see Homo (1904), 184-191; Halsberghe (1972), 138-149; Halsberghe (1984), 2196-9, cf. 2195. Unfortunately they have left little trace in the records we are here considering: little remains of the temple in situ (though some of the porphyry columns are preserved in Agia Sophia, whither they were

transported on the orders of Justinian); no coins have survived which can be firmly associated with any of theses three events, and only the one inscription; the earliest attested epigraphic evidence for the new pontifical college comes from early in the reign of Probus: CIL VI 31775 [Rome]. Though it appears Aurelian took no special title relating himself to the newly established cult, it must be assumed that his title of Pontifex Maximus henceforward referred equally to both the old and the new pontifical colleges (cf. rev. iconogr. in n.132, below).

132. [Ser, AE(Absch?)] Obv.: SOL DOMINUS IMPERI ROMANI (bare-headed draped bust of Sol r.) RIC 319 (Manns (1939), 45, no.1); SOL DOM IMP ROMANI (radiate draped bust of Sol r., beneath 4 horses to r.) RIC 320 (cf. Manns (1939), 45, no.2, reading - ROM); SOL DOM IMP ROMANI (three-quarter face radiate draped bust of Sol, beneath 4 horses, 2 r., 2 l.) RIC 321 (Manns -); SOL DOM IMP ROM (as above) RIC 322 (Manns (1939), 45, no.3). Rev. (all): AVRELIANVS AVG(ustus) CONS(ul), depicting Aurelian sacrificing.

133. Much has been written on the significance of these unique coins: see e.g. Homo (1904), 184f.; Halsberghe (1972), 139f. (cf. 155-62). Their very uniqueness, however, makes their significance more difficult to assess. For the idea that Aurelian was represented in his reign as Sol on earth, see also Homo (1904), 191-3; Halsberghe (1972), 153-5; on the idea of a general trend towards solar monotheism, see Halsberghe (1972), 149f.; cf. above n.127. Such arguments appear to stretch the evidence unduly. Other deities are attested in Aurelian's later years (see table A:16. 8, 10-11, and cf. above, n.127). Sol is certainly associated with other deities; but with the exception of Apollo (and more dubiously Jupiter, see above n.130), there is really no evidence of syncretism or absolute monotheism (as opposed to imperial patronage and favouritism). On Apollo-Sol, see above, n.114, and the ORIENS AVG type on which Sol carries an olive branch and bow (attributes of Apollo): see table A:15, sv. "Sol 6a" & "Sol 6b".

NOTES: Chapter 5

"Symbolism and Legitimation in the Mid-Third Century"

1. See above, Ch.3, nn. 25, 36, 48-9, 99, 105-6; Ch.4.a passim (cf. App. tables A:1, no.1; A:5; A:6; A:7, and table 4:1, p.120); cf. Ch.4.b and App. table A:10. On military dress and titulature in imperial symbolism from the beginning of the empire, note: Alföldi, A. (1935), esp. 6-8, 43-68; Campbell (1984), 365-414; McCormick (1986), 21ff.

2. See above, Ch.3.b passim, and nn. 15-47, 50-54 (cf. App. table A:4); Ch.4.b passim (cf. esp. nn. 23-37). On this theme, see Amit (1965), passim; on capax imperii as an important aspect of the perception of imperial authority, Tac Hist. I.49.

3. See above, Ch.3.c passim, and nn. 58-64, 70, 79-94, 103; Ch.4.b-d passim (esp. table 4:2, p.153; cf. for divine investiture also App. tables A:14; A:16).

4. See above, Ch.3, nn. 1, 15-17, 27; Ch.4, nn. 33-7; 41-55, 82, 92-3, 95-6, 99-101, 116, 118, 120-21, 123-5; see also App. tables A:9; A:11; A:13; A:15; A:16.

5. See above, Ch.3, nn. 5-8, 18-25; Ch.4, nn. 24-9 (cf. PAX, n.57); also see App. tables A:2-A:3 (Restitutor); A:15 (Oriens).

6. See above, Ch.3, nn. 46, 50-58; cf. App. table A:4.

7. In addition to those notes cited in n.6 above; also see above, Ch.3, nn. 18-25, 101-2, 104, 109-10. The same mechanism of exaggerated and inflated titulature can be seen in the representation of authority at lower levels in the power hierarchy (note how terms like perfectissimus, clarissimus and eminentissimus became increasingly important in the third century and later).

8. See above, Ch.4, nn. 31, 58, 60-62; cf. also nn. 74, 104, 119, 121-2; and also App. tables A:4; A:13. See also on this aspect of imperial symbolism, Instinsky (1942); Berlinger (1935), 25-42.

9. See above, Ch.3.c passim, and also nn. 42, 56, 85, 96. See Stertz (1974), passim.

10. Pescennius Niger was hailed the New Alexander (Dio 74.6.2a), and Alexionos took the name Alexander itself when he became Caesar (above Ch.3c, n.67); note also

Caracalla's visit to Alexander's tomb (Herodian 4.8.9; echoing Augustus' own Suet. Aug. 18.1); cf. Alföldi, A. (1935), 152-4. In particular, see above, Ch.3, nn. 57, 82, 84 (cf. also 69).

11. Over and above the constant reiteration of standard types referring to the emperor's victories, his provision of peace, security, abundance, etc., there are a number of very specific retrospective references in both the numismatic and the epigraphic evidence. For example, see above, Ch.3, nn. 28, 30, 41, 43, 51, 82, 84-5, 92-3; Ch.4, nn. 19, 21, 45, 52, 67-8, 73, 75, 86, 103. Noteworthy here is the particularly strong showing for the western emperors in this respect. There is a particularly high proportion of references back to the late second century and the early third. Already in the first half of the third century the late Antonine and to a lesser extent the early Severan periods had come to seem a longed-for past: see Alföldy (1974); but cf. below Ch.6.a. This was perhaps because this era were perceived as the last period in which the empire could still have been construed to have been in expansive, rather than defensive mode see below, Ch.7.c.

12. See above, Ch.4, nn. 74-83; App. table A:13. On this very important cluster of symbolic themes, see below, Ch.7.d.

13. See above, Ch.3, 28-41; Ch.4, nn. 67-8.

14. In particular, note above, Ch.3, n. 2; Ch.4, nn. 56, 86. This crucial theme will be more fully explored in Ch.7, below.

15. It has been shown that at least some of the same die cutters worked both before and after Postumus' revolt: see above Ch.2, n.44.

16. Drinkwater (1987), 126: "...the Gallic emperors appear to have been consistently Roman in their choice of titles: there is nothing Gallic or Germanic here whatsoever." See also König (1981), 58; and above Ch.3, n.12.

17. The attribution of such "programmatic" thinking to the choice of coin types is somewhat suspect in itself (see above, Ch.2.a). The fact that the iconography of the SALUS PROVINCIARVM types represents the Rhine (not, e.g., Gallia) might in any case suggest that the protection was meant to indicate the frontier region, rather than "The West" as a whole (see Drinkwater (1973), I 156); Webb (1933), 332, suggested the provinciae in question were "not Gaul, Spain and

Britain, but the Tres Galliae", but the two Germanies and Gallia Belgica are just as likely candidates. The type is essentially comparable to those which salute the emperor as RESTITVTOR GALLIARVM, which under Gallienus had clearly referred to securing the Rhine frontier, and which were certainly not "separatist" in sentiment (as their appearance for other emperors including Gallienus shows: see Drinkwater (1973), II 178 n.70). For the more universal titles, such as Restitutor Orbis, Defensor Orbis and Pacator Orbis, see above, Ch.3, nn. 31, 39, 43 (respectively).

18. It is generally accepted that both these cults belonged to the region of the lower Rhine; the connection with the country of the Batavi, a strong recruiting ground for the army at this time (see Le Gentilhomme (1943), 236ff.), is less certain. König (1981), 118-21, is cautious; Andreotti (1940), 4, and Drinkwater (1987), 162f., accept the connection less reservedly. In order to explain the prevalence of the Deusoniensis types, Elmer (1941), 31, speculated (ingeniously, but without evidence) that the victory that brought Postumus to the point of rebellion may have been won at Deuso. On the possibility that Postumus was himself a Batavian, see n.23, below. On the identification of the emperor with local cults generally, see Sherwin-White (1973), 415-17; cf. Nock (1972) I, 202-51. On Romano-Gallic religion in the north-east of Gaul, see Wightman (1986).

19. [Sis, sr, An, G] Siscia 40-45 (cf. RIC 573). On the interpretation of this type see Alföldi, A (1931), 12-13; Kuhoff (1979), 54. At the very least, this Gallienic type serves to dissuade us from inferring too readily a "Gallic" programme behind Postumus' Herculean coinage.

20. Not only Postumus' type within the "Labours" series (E.534-5), but also those types referring back to Commodian prototypes (E.558-9), which thereby double the connection with Rome. For these types see App. tables A:11, I; A:10, no.9b.

21. For Jupiter, see above Ch.4.d, at n.103; for Dea Roma, App. table A:13 (cf. Ch.4.c). Furthermore it should be emphasized that on some of the Roma types (App. table A:13, no.6; cf. Ch.4, n.77) we saw that the goddess was shown, in a slight modification of the usual iconography, holding the palladium, the very symbol of Rome's eternity.

22. Eutropius' use of the phrase Imperium Galliarum (Eutrop. 9.9.3) is clearly a deliberate echo of Tacitus' description of the first century revolt

(Hist. 4.12ff.). The "Gallic Empire" is still the most common designation for this later "episode" in the history of the Roman west. The absence of references either to "Imperium Galliarum" or to any of its constituent provinces in any of the material evidence for these reigns is suggestive. (According to Drinkwater (1973), I 153, "This betrays an absence of self-identification which must have been a grave weakness of the western Sonderreich." It is preferable to view the weakness as lying in our own conception of a separatist "western Sonderreich".)

23. J.A. Blanchet "Une hypothèse sur la patrie de Postume", REA 15 (1913), 431-2, suggests the area around Arras as being Postumus' patria; Hiernard (1972), 354-5 (cf. 273), avers he was of Batavian origin (on the "Batavian connection" - see above n.18; below, n.31). König (1981), 51-2, also suggests a Gallic origin for Postumus; Jullian (1920-26), IV 576, was more cautious; likewise Wightman (1985), 193, and Drinkwater (1987), 125-6 (citing Jullian; on p.163 he is almost tempted to accept Hiernard's Batavian thesis; but cf. p.79, n.169). The main arguments for the remainder of the emperors rest upon nomenclature. Victorinus is problematic: Drinkwater (1987), 126; the connection with Trier, through CIL XIII 3679 (ILS 563 = K.75), proves nothing about his origin - as Postumus' capital it is a natural place for a tribune in his praetorian guard to be: cf. König (1981), 141f.; Wightman (1970), 53-4. Tetricus is more convincingly credited with Gallic origin: König (1981), 159; Drinkwater (1987), 39, 90, 126. Of Marius nothing is known; Laelian may (on the basis of his nomen Ulpius and his "Hispania" coin type: see above, Ch.4, n.67) or may not have been of Spanish origin. The conjecture of Gallic origins for the "western" consuls rests on even more slender grounds: pace Hiernard (1972), 101-2 (suggesting probably all were Gallic); Drinkwater (1987), 29 (tentatively agreeing); König (1981), 144 (referring to Sanctus as "Gallic" without comment).

24. With the exception of Tetricus, assuredly a Roman senator (in spite of the doubts expressed by Drinkwater (1987), 39), we can be reasonably sure that the western emperors were men who had risen to prominence through the ranks of the army.

25. Gallic popular support and its fickleness is cited as the most crucial element in both the rise and the fall of Postumus and of Laelian: SHA Tyr.trig. 3.3-7, 4.1, 5.2. Gallic support is also given (supposedly in Postumus' own words) as the basis for his rule in Cont. Dion., FHG IV 194f., fr. 6. Schtajerman (1964),

406-12, and Wightman (1985), 193ff., accept this testimony; Drinkwater (1987), 67f., is less sure (but cf. p.89). Drinkwater (1987), 243-50, appears to place rather too much emphasis on the events of AD 68-70 (see below, n.31). The suggestion that the designation of this earlier revolt as an imperium Galliarum was in fact a Roman invention, in R. Urban, Der Bataveraufstand und die Erhebung des Iulius Classicus, Trier, 1985, has interesting repercussions for the third-century events. On the influence of fourth century events on the HA in this context, see Drinkwater (1987), 253.

26. On Postumus' provision of security, see van Gansbeke (1955), esp. 404-8. The desire for security is not the same as a desire for separatism: see, e.g. Drinkwater (1987), 28 (cf. p.89 on the literary testimony: "Postumus was warmly received by the Gallic civilians." See, however, Drinkwater (1987), 240, suggesting the civilian support for the western emperors was "lacklustre"). Note also the expression of Gallic solidarity for the Licinian regime in an inscription erected for Saloninus at Rome only a matter of months before the revolt: AE 1934, 161 (K.11; cf. AE 1971, 23). On the correlation between support and the distribution of inscriptions, see n. 27 below.

27. The epigraphic evidence cannot pinpoint the reversion of the allegiance of either Spain or Britain to the central emperors with any great precision: Spain reverted sometime after Postumus' fourth consulship (ca. 267: CIL II 5736 = K.58), probably on the death of Postumus (spring 269); Britain certainly recognized both Tetrici, but whether to the bitter end is debated (see above, Ch.3, n.23); an inscription from Wall, Staffordshire, RIB 2246 (K.63), apparently recognizes Claudius, posing a serious question concerning the allegiance of Britain following Postumus' death: the dismissal of this inscription by Drinkwater (1973), I 92, repeated more strongly in Drinkwater (1987), 121, 123, is not convincing; see König (1981), 146. The allegiance of Narbonensis is even less clear: apparently under Tetricus the western half of the province recognized him, while the eastern half recognized Aurelian (see n.35 below). On the area which acknowledged Postumus (and the role of Britain and Spain), see also König (1981), 54-6, 77; Drinkwater (1987), 116-18 (stressing the difficulty of assessing support from the distribution of a few inscriptions).

28. The revolt of the Aedui certainly took place in time for them to look for aid from Claudius before he died

in the summer of 270 (probably August: Rathbone (1986), 120-23; Lafaurie (1975), 987; but cf. Price, M. (1973), 77, 81); the siege of Autun lasted for some seven months, most probably all during 270, so that its end fell in the autumn of that year: Drinkwater (1987), 106, 179. It clearly cost Victorinus dearly in terms of military resources (apparently Batavian troops) he could well have deployed elsewhere. The most informative evidence for this episode comes from the Panegyrici Latini (notably V, 4.1; VIII, 4.2f.; on which, Drinkwater (1987), 78-81). See generally, Le Gentilhomme (1943), passim.

29. Respectively, Hatt (1966), 227; Besnier (1937), 208.

30. Hatt (1966), 222, based largely on the untrustworthy literary evidence: see Drinkwater (1987), 28, 67, 89.

31. The events of 270 are portrayed not as a "Gallic" incident, but as Aedui vs. Batavii: see above n.28; cf. the very localized patriotism of Cassius Dio centred on Nicea. On local "patriotism" and loyalty to Rome not being mutually exclusive, Sherwin-White (1973), 425ff. Hatt (1966), 227, rejects the simplistic notion of "nationalism", but still talks of a separatist empire of "Gallic" character. Similarly Drinkwater (1987) is content to reject "nationalism" while remaining ambivalent towards "regionalism" (p.275, sv.); he rightly wishes to place the "Gallic empire" in the context of Gallic history (Drinkwater (1987), 239-56; cf. Drinkwater (1983), 470), but does so in a way which undermines his frequent rejections of "separatism" and overplays the idea of "regionalism" (cf. Bland (1988b), 260). It is nevertheless true to say that the character of what we might call "patriotism" was undergoing changes at this time (see below, Ch.7.c; cf. Drinkwater (1987), 37-8).

32. For example: C. Jullian; M. Besnier; R. Rémondon; J.J. Hatt; J. Lafaurie; J. Hiernard.

33. Alföldi, A. (1939), 187f.; see also Bolin (1932), 57f.; Besnier (1937), 208; Schtajerman (1964), 419. Drinkwater (1987), 28-9, hedges his bets.

34. The argument for a separate senate was dismissed (in my opinion sucessfully) by König (1981), 73-5; pace Drinkwater (see above, n.33). The view that the SC on coinage is to be understood as indicating continuity rather than separatism was also espoused by Bastien (1967), 50 (cf. below, n.42). Although this leaves us with two conflicting lists of consules ordinarii, which might seem, on the face of it, historically untidy, it is not unacceptable: the situation would

only have been problematic for contemporaries at the boundaries, both geographical and temporal, of the dominion over which the western emperors exercised their authority.

35. The date of Gallienus' abortive campaign in Gaul is disputed: Alföldi (1930), suggested 263; Elmer (1940), 36f., followed by Göbl (1953), 15, 33, suggested 265; Carson (1957) and König (1981), 102-11, suggest later still; Drinkwater (1987), 105f., 171f., confirms 265 on the new chronology. The central emperors' policy of containment can be traced in various pieces of evidence: Aureolus at Milan under Gallienus, Zosimus I.40.1 (although one interpretation of Victor Caes. 33.17 and Zonaras, 12.25, appears to leave open the possibility of his being stationed in Rhaetia: Drinkwater (1987), 60; cf. below, n.37); Placidianus at Grenoble under Claudius, CIL XII 2228 (ILS 569 = K.72); the same at Vaison under Aurelian, CIL XII 1551 (K.124); Claudius' refusal to enter into hostilities with the western emperors, Zonaras, 12.26.7f; cf. Pan.lat. VIII.4.2f. On the policy of containment exercised by the central emperors, see Drinkwater (1987), 33-8, 90, 120-24; cf. Cornell & Matthews (1982), 168.

36. This theory was put forward by Fitz (1966a), 47f.; Göbl (1970), remained unconvinced, but in his review of Göbl (1970), in Alba Regia (1975), 350, Fitz repeated the allegation. However, the theory was dismissed (and in my opinion the subject closed) by Göbl (1978), II 29, n.366.

37. No doubt Aureolus hoped for some suitable reward, perhaps along the lines of the recognition Septimius (temporarily) gave to Albinus. The evidence that Aureolus minted in his own name is suspect (see above, Ch.2.d, n.71). There is an interesting parallel in the unilateral recognition of Constantine by Alexander, the would-be emperor in Africa in 308/9, for Constantine too was preoccupied with consolidating his northern power-base (which, like Postumus, was centred at Trier) and did nothing to aid his unsolicited ally: cf. Barnes (1982), 14-15; cf. Id. Constantine and Eusebius, Cambridge, Mass., 1981, 33-4.

38. The HA's characterization of these emperors as the true adsertores (Tyr.trig. 5.5) cannot be taken at face value: in this respect König (1981), 182-8 is perhaps a little naive; cf. Drinkwater (1983), 470; Drinkwater (1987), 240. Drinkwater's own position, however, does not pursue the argument far enough: cf. below, nn. 40, 42. It is worth noting in passing that

the HA elsewhere places Postumus on a par not only with other "usurpers" (such as Regalian) but also with the "legitimate emperor" Claudius (Tyr.trig. 10.14; cf. Syme (1971), 214f.).

39. The demands of the administration within the western provinces would have required that many other posts be filled, so that it is probable that this scheme of patronage went far beyond the consulship, though the evidence is sparce. We do know that Postumus also had a praetorian guard, for the future emperor Victorinus was a tribune in it: CIL XIII 3679 (ILS 563 = K.75); cf. CIL XIII 8267 and Drinkwater (1987), 130 n.101. That this kind of patronage was important can be seen in the fact that when Victorinus, Postumus' praetorian tribune (and later perhaps prefect) and one-time consular colleague, went on to claim the position of emperor in his own right, he was doubtless assisted in his claim to power by his "preferment" under Postumus (see König (1981), 141-3). On other western imperial patronage of this kind: König (1981), 66-75, 147, 169; Drinkwater (1987), 29, 130; cf. more generally on such imperial patronage, Millar (1977), Ch.VI, esp. 300-313.

40. The question "why did the western emperors not march on Rome?" is a crucial one for any interpretation of the events. The idea that Postumus hoped for reconciliation with Gallienus (König (1981), 124) is clearly nonsense. Nor is the idea that he was sick of the whole fratricidal cycle of usurpation and civil war very convincing (Hatt (1966), 227; it certainly didn't convince the central emperors, who continued to guard against the expected invasion: see above n.35). It is certainly not good enough to suggest, as scholars are still inclined to do, that Postumus and his successors simply had no ambition beyond the Alps (most recently King, A. (1990), 176; even Drinkwater (1987), 27, but cf. below). Drinkwater (1987), 241f., comes closest to the pragmatist explanation, but he does not pursue the conclusion far enough. That a pragmatism born of fear of attack in the rear was justified is suggested by the revolts that did arise against the western emperors: Laelian against Postumus at Mainz in 269; Faustinus, probably in Belgica, against Tetricus (Victor Caes. 35.4; König (1981), 169.

41. A useful contrast can be made here with the contemporary situation in the east: here neither Odenathus, who remained ostensibly loyal to Gallienus, nor Vaballathus laid claim to Roman imperial authority per se until Aurelian actually launched his campaign against the Palmyrenes in the spring of 272. Up to

this point, the symbolic representation of Vaballathus' authority in the east suggests the he was regarded as ruler of the east, but not exactly as a "Roman emperor" (for his titles at this time, inherited from his father's equivocal position, see above Ch.2.d, n.81). It was only as Aurelian's troops began to cross Asia Minor and his fleet set sail for Alexandria that Zenobia took the title Augusta and declared Vaballathus Augustus (idem for date). Even so, the eastern provinces never "seceded" from the Roman empire. On the campaign, see Downey (1950); on the notion of greater inter-ethnic forces at work in the eastern provinces at this time, with possible repercussions for the possibility of quasi-separatism, see Millar (1971).

42. By the mid-third century, the titles "Pontifex Maximus" and "Consul" were as much part of the representation of imperial authority as "Imperator Caesar Augustus"; similarly it was expected of him that he would wear the purple, that he would issue coinage (that is coinage recognizable as Roman imperial, which would include stamping the mark SC on the bronze issues) and so on (indeed having an escort of preatorian guards was similarly important: see above, n.39). When we find evidence of such activities in the case of Postumus, therefore, we are dealing with the very opposite of separatism (see above, Ch.3.a, and esp. nn. 1 and 12). It is interesting to note, in this context, that the numismatic mark SC may never have indicated "senatorial issue" under the empire: see Göbl (1978), 79; cf. Millar (1981), 70.

43. The notion of treating the phenomenon of usurpation in the third-century as an integral problem was suggested, for example, by Cornell & Matthews (1982), p.168; but few have attempted to do so. Hartmann (1982), went some of the way, but failed to explore the ramifications very far.

44. Koestler (1967), 349-53 (= "Appendix II"; cf. p.4).

NOTES: Chapter 6

"Breaking the Mould:
Transcending the Historiographical Tradition"

1. The most significant group of writers whose background, and therefore viewpoint, lay to some extent outside this "senatorial" tradition was the Christian authors, from Tertullian and Cyprian, through Lactantius and Eusebius to the Christian writers of the 4th century and beyond. The influence of the "senatorial" tradition is not as absent as might be supposed even here, however; especially as, from the late fourth century, the Church began to take over the mantle of the senate as the bastion of (classical) "civilization" (cf. below, n.13).

2. "Uncouth northerners": e.g. Dio 75.2.4-5; cf. Tacitus Agric. 21, clearly demonstrating the contempt aroused by pretensions to romanitas among northerners. Greece was, of course, a special case. In the Roman perspective, a careful distinction was drawn between the much-admired culture of classical Greece and the contemporary Hellenistic cultures of the Levant, which were viewed with some suspicion (as in Juvenal 3.59ff.: the river he objected to flowing into the Tiber was the Seleucid Orontes). In the Greek version of the rhetoric (exemplified by Aristides), Rome was the champion of (Greek) "civilization". For a more detailed and sophisticated account of this matter than is possible here, see A.N. Sherwin-White, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome, Cambridge, 1967. On the Mediterranean-based view of classical antiquity, see also Garnsey & Saller (1987), 5-19.

3. Hopkins (1983), 190-93 (cf. also below, Ch.7.c). The paradox is especially acute in response to the shifting ethnic (and social) background of those who became emperors in the third century: see below n.15 and further, Ch.7.c. On cultural and educational assimilation, Garnsey & Saller (1987), 186-8; cf. (on the prevailing value system) 110, 124.

4. Under the republic at least, senators derived their prestige to a large extent from the collective authority of the senate as a whole, which is why they feared and despised personal dominatio (or regnum) and why Cicero vilified the placing of personal dignitas above the corporate auctoritas: Cicero de Rep. I.53, 65-9; II.56; III.23; pro Sest. 96-143; cf. Nepos, de excel., XVII Ages., 4.1-3. On the rationale and practical consequences see Beard & Crawford (1985), 55-61; Wirszubski (1950), esp. 1-17, 30, 40ff.

5. This idea was explored by de Jouvenel in his discussion on "Les racines aristocratiques de la liberté" in Du Pouvoir (1947), 387-410 (= de Jouvenel (1952), 317-36); cf. Wirszubski (1950), 136-8.

6. This outlook permeated most of the literature of the time (such as the works of Cicero, Nepos, Quintilian, the two Plinys, Dio Chrysostom, Juvenal and Aristides), not just the historians; and this wider cultural ethos has continued to exercise a particularly strong influence over the medieval and modern attitudes to political authority at Rome and has thus contributed greatly to the shape of the historiographical tradition on the Roman empire.

7. Sometimes the juxtaposition is effected with consummate ease, as in the works of the younger Pliny (above all the Panegyric). For the effect of this rhetoric on the senatorial conceptions of the emperor, see below n.15 and also Ch.7.d.

8. On the use of the term tyrannus in ancient literature, its transformation from the original sense of the Greek term turannos and its application to the Roman imperial context, see Springer (1952), esp. 78-115. In the early empire it is applied to emperors of whom the author disapproves (usually on the grounds here described): Springer (1952), 83-100. Note the significant shift during the first one hundred years of imperial rule in the criteria used to distinguish the good ruler from the tyrant, from Cicero's iustitia to Seneca's clementia: see Wirszubski (1950), 143-7, esp. 146.

9. The senatorial rhetoric of liberty never amounted to a simplistic opposition to autocratic power as such (see below, n.10) nor to a desire to return to a "republican" form of government (as the events of AD 41 clearly demonstrated: see Suet. Claud. 10; and esp. Josephus Ant. 19.18.6.). It is important, therefore, to distinguish the senatorial admiration, in certain cases veneration, for individuals (notably Cato of Utica, the "Tyrannicides" Brutus and Cassius and Thrasea Paetus) whose unshakable and spirited defence of senatorial values and dignity had earned them a special place within this senatorial ideology from a political opposition, properly speaking: see Wirszubski (1950), 136-47. The key factor was the deference of the emperor towards the senate (see e.g., Tac. Ann. 4.6, 13.4; Suet. Tib. 30ff.; Calig. 16.2; Claud. 12; Pliny Pan. 45.3, 54, 55.6f., 62.3f.). See generally, Wallace-Hadrill (1982b), passim.

10. Augustus' own Res Gestae (esp. RG 1-2) puts forward precisely this angle, as do Tacitus Agric. 3.1, and Pliny Paneg. 58.3, 78.3. Absolute monarchy could thereby be accepted, even welcomed, within the constraints of the old rhetoric (see, e.g., Dio 53.17.1; Suet. Aug. 28; Seneca de Benef. 2.20, 6.32; Pliny Paneg., passim, note esp. 54-5; Pliny Ep. 3.20.12)

11. Active military service had been part of public life, of the cursus honorum, but was now increasingly not so (for consequences, see Ch.7.c below).

12. By the third century soldiers were notorious for their various acts of intimidation and for their abuses of legal privileges: MacMullen (1963), passim. This intensified the reaction of the educated classes: see Alföldy (1974), passim, esp. 99f. The hostility with regard to what was seen as the "militarization" imperial policy can be seen in (e.g.): Dio (73.11-12), Herodian (2.6.6-13) and the HA (Did.Jul. 2.5-3.6) on the "auction" in AD 193; Dio on Septimius' dying words (77.15.2); Aurelius Victor (Caes, 36.1) asserting, defensively, the senate's "rightful" role as imperial electors, in opposition to the soldiers'. (The suggestion that Pertinax defaulted on his promised donatives to the soldiers [SHA Pert. 15.7], which might have contributed to his unpopularity with the soldiers [14.6; cf 10.10], should probably be discounted [cf. Dio, 73.1.2, and 5.4]. However, a similar story for Didius Julianus is more plausible [Herodian 2.7.1]). As a Christian who had lived through the persecutions, and not of the same "senatorial" mould, Lactantius (e.g. de mort. 7.2, cf. 7.4, on Diocletian's army policy) had a rather different axe to grind against the military emperors and their armies; but the complaints are similar.

13. This notion of decline (as natural to the Roman elite as the opposite notion of progress has become in much of European thought over the last two centuries) can be found in such diverse works as Pliny's Natural History, Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria, Tacitus' Dialogus and the Satires of Juvenal, as well as running through the historical works such as those of Sallust and Tacitus. In late antiquity, and especially in historiography, the rhetoric of decline becomes a ubiquitous frame of reference, sometimes reaching very shrill notes (the only significant exception being panegyrics and other such orations, which favourably compare the present with the immediate past; but these are clearly special cases). This prevailing view was only partially turned around

by post-Augustinian Christian concentration on better things to come in the next world.

14. Dio 72.36.4; a sentiment echoed many times elsewhere (e.g. Herodian 2.8.4). See Alföldy (1974), 98f. Even in the early third century, however, such sentiments were at best somewhat anachronistic, for "decline" on this scale of values had been evident from as early as the late republic.

15. The prejudices of Romanity (above, n.2) reacted against these emperors as rough soldiers from the north (e.g. Aurelian: SHA Aur. 21.5-8, 36.2, 39.8), or as unworthy despots tainted with "orientalizing" tendencies (e.g. Diocletian: Victor Caes. 39). For the writers of the fourth century, the only way in which these rough practical soldiers could act as the preservers of romanitas was in keeping at bay the even less civilized invaders beyond the frontiers. Thus the HA praises emperors of outstanding military achievement, while levelling charges of effeminacy and military incompetence at emperors of whom it disapproves. (Thus the HA's principal sympathy for the rivals of Gallienus: (e.g.) Tyr.trig. 3.4; 5.5-8; 10.14.)

16. On this later shift in the sense of the term tyrannus (though the older sense persisted alongside: cf. above n.8), see Springer (1952), 101-09, esp. 105; fifth century and later sources, such as Zosimus, use it more in the sense of Gegenkaiser (Springer (1952), 109-11; Zosimus uses the term exclusively in a fourth century context, on the significance of which see below, Ch.7, n.6).

17. In the Renaissance, what was ancient was admired (Pericles I.1.10); on the "Cult of Antiquity", see H. Butterfield The Statecraft of Machiavelli, London, 1955, Ch.II.1. By the eighteenth century this had given way to admiration of the much more narrowly defined "classics".

18. This was especially true from half-way through the 17th century to half-way through the 19th: as in literature (Milton, Dryden, Addison, whom Pope satirized as "Atticus", and Pope himself all imitated classical works in addition to translating them; Samuel Johnson, himself an immitator of Juvenal, characterized the age of Addison and Pope as the "Augustan Age", identifying his own with "Silver Age" Rome), so in politics (Frederick the Great and Catherine the Great each professed to be the first servant of the state, in imitation of the ancient rhetoric [Suet. Tib. 29 (cf. 24.2); Dio Chrysostom

III.75; the idea was repeated by Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius]; Jefferson and the other authors of "The Declaration of Independence" clearly saw themselves as latter-day Roman senators; and Napoleon rose from army officer, first to "Consul" then to "Emperor").

19. The excesses Burke perceived in the French Revolution, for example, horrified him just as they would have horrified Cicero: liberté in 1789-90 no longer resembled classical libertas so much as licentia. It should be noted the Reflections on the Revolution in France (1790) were written long before the advent of the Terror. With reference to the Enlightenment in general and Gibbon in particular, see Pocock (1985), 145-8; cf. de Jouvenel (loc.cit., n.5 above).

20. The whig rhetoric of liberty is perfectly illustrated in Addison's highly successful anti-Caesarian tragedy, Cato, wherein the eponymous hero vows his readiness to accept only "liberty or death" (II.i), and in Patrick Henry's famous rhetorical flourish "Give me liberty or give me death!" (clearly modelled on the same).

21. This discourse (which must be seen against the backdrop of the rise of monarchical power, beginning early in the sixteenth century) found expression in the works of a distinguished succession of political theorists and philosophers, from Bodin, through Locke, Montesquieu, Rousseau and J.S. Mill down to Popper and Bertrand Russell. The most notable exception to this trend was Hobbes (whose opinions owed much to his experiences of the Civil War), who advocated strong sovereign power, concluding that the ancient rhetoric of liberty, with which he particularly associated Aristotle and Cicero, was a positive menace to the common weal (esp. Leviathan II, ch.21). It was, however, the ideas of Locke and not those of Hobbes that won the day.

22. With reference to modern politics there is among the western intelligentsia a noticeable hostility and lack of understanding towards political leaders (of both the right and the left) whose public image is essentially military. The most obvious examples are in Latin American states, where the military is traditionally, and sometimes constitutionally, regarded as the guardian and protector of the state from internal as well as external threats and therefore inevitably heavily involved in politics. Leaders in these states have tended to present themselves in an openly military fashion, whether originally career military men, such as Pinochet, or men who have adopted this presentation in response to

expectations, such as Ortega or Castro. (The British Government's assertion of its rights in the Falklands War, whatever their actual merits, was facilitated by the military style of Galtieri's junta.)

23. For example, Rostovtzeff (1957) I, 448, saw in Septimius' rule a deliberate policy of "militarization" which inevitably led to militarism and decline: cf. pp. 457f., 463-5, 469-501, 510ff, 531ff., etc.; note also his coining of the terms "Military Monarchy" [Ch.IX] for the Severan era and "Military Anarchy" [Ch.X] to describe the mid-third century; cf. Grant (1968), 5. For Rostovtzeff, the onset of the "Dominate" called to mind unpleasant parallels with 20th century Russia; whence his evident distaste for the period.

24. For the Enlightenment, as later for the Romantics, Roman imperial history was seen as a long but inevitable path to dissolution and it was only a matter of time before the more wholesome barbarians to the north swept away the refuse: thus e.g. Gibbon (1909-14), I, 58 (but this owes more to the tone of Tacitus' Germania than to Rousseau's ideas of a Noble Savage); for the Enlightenment view (notably Gibbon, Hume, Adam Smith) of the inevitability of the "decline and fall", see Pocock (1985), 146-8. For the Romantics, the decadence and collapse of the Roman empire was imbued with anachronistic sentiments of nationalism (evoking parallels with the crumbling "oriental" Ottoman Empire: e.g. Byron, Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, IV 139ff. For the late Romantics of the fin-de-siècle Decadent movement, the appeal of late antiquity lay precisely in its "decadence" (thus the evocation of late antique authors to convey the decadence of the late 19th century mind in J.-K. Huysmanns' A Rebours).

25. Put simply, the benign and civilized "Principate" could be reconciled with "liberty", but the corrupt and arbitrary "Dominate" could not. The apotheosis of the Antonine Age as the last great florescence of "classical civilization" before the "decline" set in was begun by contemporary orators (notably Aristides), given its canonical expression by Gibbon (1909-14), I, 85, and has continued ever since.

26. MacMullen (1988), 1-57, offers an analysis of "decline" which rightly differentiates various levels; but this analysis too suffers from presumptions based upon notional, and rather arbitrary, ideals of objectivity in the assessment of aesthetic criteria to measure decline.

27. Examples abound: see (e.g.) Berenson (1954); L'Orange (1965) - note the original title: Fra Principat til Dominat; Hannestad (1986), on which see my review JRS 79 (1989), 218f. Such attitudes to the history of Roman art, involving "decline" based largely on aesthetic assessments, lie within a tradition stretching back through Vasari to the likes of the elder Pliny. On the need for a more cautious and more balanced approach, and what this might be, see Boatswain (1988).

28. On the multiple layers of (Roman) "society" and interlocking social networks see Mann, M. (1986), esp. 1-2, 52, 251-3, 259-60; Garnsey & Saller (1987), 186-95. The concept "Roman" certainly changed considerably over the centuries between Augustus and Justinian; this was not, I maintain, due to a dramatic shift in the third century but due to a gradual process of realignment (see below, Ch.7.c). Dagron (1968), 83-119, is surely right to detect an important shift amounting to "une nouvelle Romanité" in the 4th century, but he underestimates the extent to which this shift is anticipated in the century and a half before Constantine.

29. Among the many works dealing with this vast subject, I have found the following especially useful: Bourdieu (1977); Foucault (1980); Foucault (1984); Geertz (1977); de Jouvenel (1952); de Jouvenel (1957); Koestler (1983); Mann, M. (1986); Shils (1965); Sperber (1975); Wrong (1979).

30. Notably, Arendt (1970), esp. 35-52, where explicit references are made to the classical past. On power as confrontation, see also Lukes (1974), 21-2. Giddens (1979), 90, points out that there is no logical reason why power must act contrary to the power-subject's interests; a point also made by Wrong (1979), 21-2.

31. Wrong (1979), 252 (also ibid., 4); Russell (1975), 25; but cf. (contra Weber, e.g. in Weber (1968), I, 53.) Giddens (1979), 92: "The notion of power has no inherent connection with intention or 'will'."

32. See, e.g., Collingwood (1942), 153-4. Needless to say, this point is also insisted upon by Freud. Even Wrong (1979), 253, admits that "one can and should recognize that power is inherent in all social interaction".

33. On the centrality of order in this sense: Bull (1977), 3-8; (as the antithesis of chaos) Giddens

(1976), 98; see also Shils (1965), 203ff. (whence quotation, p.203).

34. Shils (1965), 205; cf. Winch (1967), 99-100. On the crucial (constitutive) connection between power networks and social action/social structure, see Mann, M. (1986), 1-2, 9, 13.

35. Weber (1968), I, 53; cf. Wrong (1979), 23.

36. The nature of power relations and the proportion of the various forms of power involved in them can be assessed according to three indices: <u>extensiveness</u> (the ratio of power-wielders to power-subjects; the distance over which power relations extend), <u>comprehensiveness</u> (the variety of actions over which a power-wielder can exercise control in the power-subjects) and <u>intensity</u> (the limits within which the power-wielder's control can be pushed and still obtain compliance; the degree of commitment on the part of power-subjects inspired by the power-wielder). On this see the somewhat differing accounts in de Jouvenel (1958), 160, and Mann, M. (1986), 7; see also Wrong (1979), 14ff.

37. It is possible to define "coercion" simply as threat, as opposed to "force", as Wrong (1979), 24-8, 41-4; but this is somewhat confusing since the distinction can be very slight indeed, and such a distinction weakens the two concepts greatly, especially in terms of their interrelationship (cf. below, n.46).

38. Both the terms "power" and "authority" are complicated in their application to social science by their rather loose usage in every-day parlance (see Bayles (1976), 101ff.). I take it that <u>authority is a form of power</u>. Bell sees a need to keep power, authority and influence theoretically distinct; but influence outside power is simply equivalent to advice. Furthermore his division of authority into "power-authority" and "influence-authority" (Bell (1975), 39ff.) merely underlines the impracticality of this theoretical division. In practice, any theory which purports to regard authority as an <u>alternative</u> to power rapidly becomes untenable on internal grounds (as, for example, Bell (1975), esp. 15f., 19-26, 35ff.; Peters (1967), 92-4). There remains, none the less, a crucial distinction between coercion, influence and authority: see below, n.46. As Wrong (1979), 239-43, points out (<u>contra</u> Parsons and Giddens), authority, however defined, cannot be seen as a <u>basis</u> of power. On authority as essentially fiduciary, see Krieger (1973), 146.

39. On these aspects of power in general, and authority in particular, see: Bell (1975) 17, 63; Jenkins (1976), 36; Watt (1982), 27ff., 105ff.; Krieger (1973), 146; Wrong (1979), 2; Foucault (1980), 95-6, 142, 159, 198; Foucault (1984), 92ff.; Foucault (1982), 217ff., 223.

40. Giddens (1979), 93; Wrong (1979), 10-11; Foucault (1980), 99-100. Power relations must therefore constantly face in both directions, and each apex in the pyramidal structure is also a new base (a pattern that is repeated at all levels throughout the social structure): see Koestler (1967), 50-58; Koestler (1983), 23-56.

41. On awe and belief ("miranda" and "credenda") as part of the mechanics of authority, see C.E. Merriam, Political Power, New York, 1934; cf. Bell (1975), 35ff., 42ff.

42. Wrong (1979), 113, 119-20; Arendt (1970), 39: "The will to power and the will to submission are interconnected."

43. Wrong (1979), 3; cf. Rieff (1979), 240.

44. To regard the parent/child relationship as the paradigm of all authority is not necessarily to be quite as reductionist as Freud himself tended to be (esp. in Totem and Taboo: see Rieff (1979), 236-45); and Freud is certainly not alone in believing it: Aristole, Pol. I.ii-v; Rousseau, Contrat Social, II.ii; de Jouvenel (1952), 65; Cannadine (1983), 110 (to instance but a few; see further below, Ch.7.d and esp. nn. 50-51). For a dissenting voice, Winch (1967), 104; Adams (1976), 6f., remains ambivalent.

45. Wrong (1979), 120-1. It is precisely for this reason that the operation of power itself may not be seen as merely an exercise of control from above, but must be understood as part of an integrated social structure which is impelled at least as much from below: see Foucault (1984), 94, and above, n.40. For the Freudian interpretation, see (e.g.) Sigmund Freud Totem and Taboo, [S.E.13] London (1953), 148 (= Pelican Freud Library, 13 (1985), 210f.); cf. Rieff (1979), 222-3.

46. The characteristic response to authority is an automatic one (Bell (1975), 59: "...in practice authority...relies on automatic acceptance"). On the relationship between command/obedience and authority, see: Krieger (1973), 146; Bell (1975), 18, 35ff.; Watt (1982), 15f.; Eisenstadt (1968), xlii-xliii; cf. de

Jouvenel (1952), 96f.; Easton (1958), 182: "Anyone who is regularly obeyed is an authority." On the possible consequences, see also below, n.58. Though coercion and rational conviction are not in themselves part of the operational mechanism of authority, they may contribute to the structure of the command/response relationship without themselves directly conditioning the response to any specific command (cf. above, n.38). Note Krieger (1973), 141:

> Originally, [the] dominant meaning [of authority] was the capacity to evoke voluntary compliance or assent, on grounds distinct from coercive power or rational conviction. Currently, its dominant meaning is the capacity to evoke compliance or assent, whether voluntary or not, on grounds which confer an official right upon coercive power and a compulsory force upon rational conviction.

On the other hand, of course, such a definition begs the question of how to define "rightful" in a way which is not dependent upon authority: see below, n.65.

47. Habit rather than fear of consequences: de Jouvenel (1952), 22; habit also contagious: de Jouvenel (1957), 24; cf. Winch (1967), 100: "All characteristically human activities involve an <u>established</u> way of doing things." (Emphasis original.)

48. Properly speaking it is the symbols, not the authority, which are held: Bell (1975), 18; Shils (1965), 210.

49. Thus we talk of "Augustan Rome", "the Lutheran Reformation", "the Napoleonic Wars"; modern concepts like "Thatcherism" and "Reaganomics" are employed to denote highly complex economic and socio-political phenomena which have an extremely ill-defined relationship with the individuals whose names they invoke. This also explains the strongly biographical tendency of most historiography (on problems arising from this tendency, see Carr <u>What is History</u>? (1975), 31-55). On the anthropomorphization of power, Geertz (1977), 153. On the Freudian notion of the personification of political authority, Rieff (1979), 235-40 (cf. below, n.68).

50. Giddens (1979), 91; see also Mann, M. (1986), 6.

51. On repetitive patterns, Bell (1975), 17. (See also, on these patterns within educational systems, P. Bourdieu and J.-C. Passeron (trans. P. Nice), <u>Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture</u>, London, 1977, 15ff.) Such repetitive patterns as part

of the assertion of dominance in group behaviour is not a purely human phenomenon: see Jane Goodall, In the Shadow of Man, London (1973), 117ff. Note also Giddens (1979), 92: "Resources are the media whereby transformative capacity is employed as power in the routine course of social interaction; but they are at the same time structural elements of social systems as systems, reconstituted through their utilization in social interaction."

52. On the vital link between symbolism and thought, see Bourdieu (1977), 167; cf. also below, n.59.

53. On relationship between power, prestige and wealth, see Wrong (1979), 226-36; cf. Russell (1975), 9.

54. On the inseparability of power and its symbolic manifestations, see Geertz (1977), 152, where he likens the relationship between the symbolics and the substance of power to that between mass and energy; cf. Bourdieu (1977), 165.

55. On symbolic capital and its transmutability in relation to economic capital, see Bourdieu (1977), 177ff. On the significance of gift-giving and gift-exchange as part of the mechanism, see Bourdieu (1977), 195, cf. 3ff. On such expenditures as a necessary (and continual) aspect of the functioning of authority, see Geertz (1977), passim; on the value of such actions as part of a focus for symbolic incorporation, see Simon (1980), 48; Eisenstadt (1968), xli; Cohn (1983), 171f. Cannadine (1983), 104, warns of the crudeness of the Durkheimian model; nevertheless it must be broadly on the right lines: cf. Hobsbawm (1983a), 7f. See also below, Ch.7, nn. 23-25.

56. On the necessity for constant repetition, see Geertz (1977), 153: "majesty is made, not born"; cf. the famous speech of Ulysses in Troilus and Cressida, III, iii, 145ff.; or Ferdinand's speech in Webster's The Duchess of Malfi, III, ii, 142ff. On visible authority as self-legitimating, see also Shils (1965), 211 (cf. below, n.69).

57. Mann, M. (1986), 47, following Durkheim.

58. The experiments of Stanley Milgram are a startling proof of what lengths the internalized structure of authority is able to press compliance in the name of a justifying cause (in this case the furtherance of scientific knowledge): S. Milgram, Obedience to Authority, New York, 1974; cf. Koestler (1983), 83-90. In this way, as social beings, we are prepared to

tolerate, condone and even perpetrate acts of extreme cruelty in the name of authority that would be more or less impossible acting merely on our own initiative. For the psychological self-defensive mechanisms involved, see Anna Freud The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defence, New York, 1946, 117-31; cf. Wrong (1979), 111-13, citing the results of studies on prisoners from Dachau and Buchenwald by Bettelheim in The Informed Heart, Glencoe, IL (1960), 169-75.

59. Geertz (1977), 157-60; de Jouvenel (1957), 43; Shils (1965), 205.

60. On centrality and charisma: Geertz (1977), 151f., 171; Shils (1965), 201, 205; Eisenstadt (1968), xxiv-xxvi. I use the term charisma in the broad sense used by, among others, Geertz, Winch and Shils in his "Charisma, Order and Status"; for a narrower definition, see the entry on "Charisma", by Shils, in The International Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences, New York (1968), ii, 386-90. (On complications in Weber's usage, see below, n.64.)

61. Thus symbolism is not so much a language as "a non-semiological cognitive system": Sperber (1975), 87; cf. 90. On symbolism, meaning and interpretation, see Sperber (1975), passim (esp. pp. 8-16, 48, 84 ff.); Todorov (1983), 19.

62. Geertz (1977), 152, 167: "Both the structure and the expression of social life change, the inner necessities that animate it do not."

63. This is especially true in societies which, like most preindustrial societies, place a particularly high premium on tradition. Geertz (1975), 7, 14, 449; Geertz (1977), 168; Winch (1967), 107f.; Eisenstadt (1968), xliv; Shils (1965), 210; Bell (1975), 48; Cannadine (1983), 104f.; Hobsbawm (1983a), 2. On instances of invented tradition and how it works, Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), passim.

64. See Winch (1967), 107; also Shils (1965), 200, 206, cf. 203; also Friedrich (1972), 90ff.; Bell (1975), 42ff. (cf. above, n.60).

65. The very existence of laws, and the legal systems within which they operate, are "entirely dependent for their effectiveness upon the prior existence of...authority relationships" (Jenkins (1976), 43); though authority may be externalized with reference to the structural framework of legal forms. See further Jenkins (1976), 41-3; Foucault (1980), 140f.; cf. Friedrich (1972), 89-98. This point is of special

significance in the context of imperial authority at Rome (below, Ch.7.b). Note the circularity of the opposing argument, as exemplified by Watt (1982), 43, 84 (etc.).

66. In a given social context certain elements of legitimation may seem "definitive", but even here symbolic repetition is imperative. This is not to say that a coronation, for example, need take place more than once (indeed such repetition might even be counter-productive: as in King John iv, 2, 1-39); but it must constantly be symbolically paraded (in this case by wearing the crown, certain robes of state, etc.). See above, n.56.

67. See above, n.52; also Foucault (1980), passim. We should not dismiss the role of physical characteristics (such as size, strength or intelligence) and even less tangible focuses of legitimation. Thus in Golding's Lord of the Flies (Peguin ed., 1960, p.22):

> ...the clamour changed from the general wish for a chief to an election by acclaim of Ralph himself. None of the boys could have found good reason for this; what intelligence had been shown was traceable to Piggy while the most obvious leader was Jack. But there was a stillness about Ralph as he sat that marked him out: there was his size, and attractive appearance; and most obscurely, yet most powerfully, there was the conch. The being that had blown that, had sat waiting for them on the platform with the delicate thing balanced on his knees, was set apart.

68. In contrast to Weber, for whom the "charismatic father-leader is inevitably displaced by bureaucratic organization," Freud believed that, "To be effective, organizations must in some sense incarnate the founding father." (Rieff (1979), 236; cf. above, n.49.) On the symbolic interplay between individuals and the political (or other) power systems they founded, see de Jouvenel (1957), 32; Eisenstadt (1968), xxi; Shils (1965), 207; cf. 202, 209. This symbolic interplay is particularly evident in the Soviet system (much in the news today, with the spontaneous destruction of monuments to Lenin and Dzerzhinsky); but even within highly formalized systems of power, such as that laid down in the American constitution, it is surprisingly prominent (notable, for example, in the inauguration of George Bush in January 1989: the first president named George since Washington, he used the very Bible Washington

had used to be sworn in precisely two centuries earlier).

69. On the importance of the perception of success: Peters (1967), 88f. (echoing Weber; note especially the footnote inspired by Gellner on p.88); Wrong (1979), 5-6.

70. As we saw above, in highly traditional societies, the emphasis placed on tradition is intensified the more the traditions of that society are threatened by change. For the value of conservative ritual in a changing world, see Cannadine & Price (1987), passim. The process of legitimation in a given context is to some extent the result of a consensus; but while the perception of a consensus is always desirable, and while authority relations are likely to be more efficient and usually more durable with a genuine consensus, this is not a prerequisite for authority relations to function. For contrary view, however, see Shils (1965), 211; Arendt (1970), 35ff.; and see also J.G. Merquior, Rousseau and Weber: Two Studies in the Theory of Legitimacy, London, 1980, esp. p.2.

71. Note the illuminating analogy with radio broadcasting in Hobsbawm (1983b), 263. The idea that the belief necessary for authority can be created is misguided. (In the context of Roman imperial ideology, Charlesworth (1937) and others; see above, Ch.2.a.)

72. In the present century the potential for carefully calculated orchestration has been exploited with alarming efficiency. Many regimes, notably those of a totalitarian persuasion, have developed propaganda machines capable of highly sophisticated manipulation of popular emotions. However, these developments have depended upon technological advances, especially in the field of communication and electronics, which are peculiar to this century. The taint of fascism is unfortunately a highly emotive one and has brought to the term "propaganda" a host of unwarranted and distracting assumptions. (On the problems presented by the term "propaganda", see above, Ch.2.a, n.15.)

73. According to some views "ideology" is seen as little more than "lies"; but fortunately this view is not so prevalent as to render the former term unserviceable. On the erroneous dichotomy between "ideology" and "truth", see Foucault (1980), 118; Wrong (1979), 99-103 (esp. 102f., citing Mannheim). On the will to believe and the desire to participate, see above, nn. 45, 49, 57.

74. It should also be noted that, though we are primarily concerned with usurpation of sovereign power, the

forcible appropriation of power is a phenomenon that can take place on any level of the socio-political structure. On usurpation in the Roman context, see below Ch.7.b.

"The legacy of Augustus"

1. Syme (1960), 112ff. See below, nn. 17-19. As an individual of incomparable wealth with an immense network of powerful connections and the allegiance of an unprecedented number of soldiers and veterans, Octavian was in himself the most eloquent testimony to the senate's loss of authority: see above, Ch.6.a, n.4.

2. His own meteoric rise, as much as the fate of his adoptive father, demonstrated the dangers of prolonging an atmosphere of crisis by an indefinite reliance on what today might be termed "emergency powers". To avoid this required the outward restitution of res publica and the refusal of such ominous titles as dictator, consul for life, etc. (avoidance of "rex" goes without saying): RG 5-6.1; on all this, Dio 53.17.1 ff., and see also below, nn. 16, 44.

3. Millar (1984), passim. That this exceptional recognition was prevalent even at Rome is shown by the fact that within years of the battle of Actium there were, in addition to any other honours and dedications, 80 silver statues of the victor: RG 24.2; Suet. Aug. 52 (cited as an example of recusatio and of his pietas). See also Wallace-Hadrill (1986), 71.

4. On the legal powers and the settlements see Millar (1981), 33ff. It is significant to note that by the time of Vespasian not only were most of these disparate elements collectively enacted in the so-called lex de imperio, but that this enactment, as it is preserved for us is infact not a lex but a senatus consultum, in spite of the continued stress on the popular mandate: see below, Ch.7.c, n.42.

5. Dio 53.17.3; cf. Gibbon (1909-14), I 66-80, esp. 78 (regarding the arrangements as a "farce"). On the relationship between legality and authority see above, Ch.6.c, n.65. In any case to regard Augustus' settlements as fraudulent, or even devious, is surely to underestimate the constraints of the senatorial outlook: Octavian/Augustus was a masterful political strategist, but he was clearly no revolutionary; indeed he was a born and bred member of the Roman senatorial aristocracy, steeped in the highly conservative values of the senatorial elite.

6. On <u>princeps</u> and <u>legitimus</u>, Wickert (1954), 2290-93, noting the six occasions of the juxtaposition of these two terms, all in Ammianus.

7. Augustus rightly makes much of his supremacy in <u>auctoritas</u> (<u>RG</u> 34.3); the term is difficult to render in English, meaning something between "authority" and "influence", or perhaps more accurately between the slang terms "face" and "clout". The link between <u>auctoritas</u> and <u>dignitas</u>, clearly outlined in the writings of Cicero, is borne out by the fact that the Greek term ἀξίωμα frequently stood for both. On Augustus' <u>auctoritas</u> see Brunt & Moore (1973), 78-80, 84-5. That Augustus' authority vastly exceeded the sum of its "constitutional" parts is obvious: Millar (1977), 616ff., cf. 277. On the wayward notion of legalized <u>auctoritas</u>, see von Premerstein (1937), 176-225; but cf. above, n.5 (and also below at n.22). It is not that <u>auctoritas</u> became the constitutional basis of his power, as Grant (1946) would have it, but that within what is meant by Augustus' imperial power "the legal and supralegal become inextricably intertwined": Wallace-Hadrill (1986), 73; cf. 70-73; see also Kantorowicz (1957), 102f.

8. On some of the effects of these ambiguous conflations, see Wallace-Hadrill (1982b); Price, S. (1980); Price, S. (1987), esp. 57-8; Millar (1977), 277f. On the semantic fluidity of the terminology (especially of the key terms <u>libertas</u>, <u>princeps</u>, <u>dominus</u> etc.) which assisted the ambiguities and their acceptance, see above, Ch.6.a. See also below nn. 42-5.

9. On the lack of institutional government apparatus (and the consequent use of the imperial household, etc.) Millar (1981), 52ff. On the personal nature of imperial patronage, see also Hopkins (1983), 171ff.; Millar (1977), 9, and more broadly, (chapter III) 59-131.

10. MacMullen (1988), 58-121, distinguishes between what he terms "public power" and "private power" (as "power

effective"); but he fails to recognize the vital point that governmental power itself (equated in his eyes with "formally bestowed authority": e.g. p.118), no less than that wielded by individuals, operated through "private" networks. Imperial authority in fact depended upon the activation of informal, yet very real, networks of power that, directly or indirectly, spread out across the whole empire and down to the lowest power levels. The dichotomy between what should be seen as "official" and what "unofficial" is particularly misleading when applied to the third century. On the unnecessary complications of "official" as a category, see above Ch.2.a at n.21. See also above n.7.

11. Cameron, A.M. (1987), 124; cf. Mommsen (1887-8), II 1135ff.; note also Tacitus Ann. I.4, on the problems of succession caused by the ambiguity of Augustus' position; and see now G. Bowersock "Augustus and the East: The problem of the succession" in Millar & Segal (1984), 169-88. (Cromwell, also a victorious army commander in civil war, was faced with a similar predicament of ensuring political succession in circumstances where he likewise had to be circumspect with regard to monarchical representation.) Though the principle of heredity exerted a strong influence over the procedures of political succession in the Roman empire (below, nn. 17 and 18), the notion of hereditary succession was never formalized. Significantly, in Roman society in general there was no concept comparable to the feudal notion of primogeniture. Indeed the transference of political power to the next generation was not an easy matter at the senatorial level of Roman imperial society either: see Hopkins (1983), 120-200.

12. On the absence of definitive inaugural ceremonial, see Cameron, A.M. (1987), 127. The Byzantine inauguration ritual grew out of late Roman antecedents (notably the elevation of Julian), but only gradually became definitive from the middle of the fifth century. For the ritual: Ensslin (1943); Corippus, esp. In laud. Iust. 2.137-58; cf. Cameron, A.M. (1976), ad loc.; see also J.L. Nelson "Symbols in Context", Studies in Church History, 13 (1976), 97-119. For the equivalent developments in medieval court ceremonial in the west, see J.L. Nelson, "The Lord's anointed and the people's choice: Carolingian royal ritual", in Cannadine & Price (1987), 137-180. The absence of definitive inaugural ritual and the lack of intrinsic objects of determinative regalia apply equally to the Hellenistic monarchies (Smith (1988), 36: "There was never one particular diadem invested with unique authority imparted to whoever

wore it ... there seems to have been no ritual or ceremonial involved in putting it on." Significantly he adds that this was mainly because Alexander had had none: cf. below, nn.14-15).

13. Dio, 53.17.8, correctly observed that the names Caesar and Augustus in themselves confer no legal powers; and this is true also of the other two titles which most succinctly sum up the position of emperor, Princeps and Imperator. As already noted, however (above, n.5) this is not really the point: these titles were certainly pregnant with authority, most especially the title "Augustus" (which, as Dio says [53.18.2], was an affirmation of the splendour of his ἀξίωμα). On the ambiguities and layers of meaning in the title "Augustus", see Brunt & Moore (1973), 77f. (cf. RG 34.2; Suet. Aug. 7.2); as Gibbon (1909-14), I 78, somewhat cynically remarked: "Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names."

14. On the special importance of the title "Augustus" in mid-third century, see above Ch.3.a, p.74f. and n.2; cf. also Ch.5.a, 168f. The term "successor" was never applied to Roman emperors, but there are interesting parallels with two political systems where the term was used: the "succesors" (diadochoi) of Alexander (who took over and adapted to their own purposes those aspects of the symbolic representation of the "founder" of the empire which seemed most significant, laying particular stress on the diadem, the symbol most intimately associated with Alexander and with the legitimating force of his military victories); and the Calif, or "successor" (kalifa) to the Prophet's temporal power (whose claim to authority was largely legitimated through the repetition of prayers on his behalf every Friday and whose "name and superscription" were placed on the coinage; sometimes referred to as "Mosque and Mint").

15. On ambiguity as strength, Wallace-Hadrill (1982b); cf. Millar (1977), 617. The same kind of reference back to the charismatic founder (imitatio) lies behind the representation of Hellenistic royal authority, where again much of the "meaning" is to be understood as "successor to Alexander" (see Smith (1988), 36). On the significance of the founder in the representation of authority, see above Ch.6.c, at n.68 (and cf. below, Ch7.d and nn. 50-52).

16. The fact that the title "Princeps" carried no legal force (Wickert (1954), 2290; cf. above, n.13) did not prevent it from being an integral part of Roman imperial titulature and as such part of the symbolic representation of imperial authority (Syme (1960),

311f.; and see above Ch.3.b). Octavian was voted the republican title <u>princeps senatus</u> in 28 BC, the year before his first so-called "constitutional settlement"; the timing is almost certainly not coincidental, for the "restoration" of the senate's authority was bound to enhance that of the senate's principal member from whose hands it was gratefully received. See <u>RG</u> 7.2, and note Greek gloss, πρώτον αξιώματος τόπον; cf. Brunt & Moore (1973), 49 (note ad loc). On the accomodation of Augustus' position into the senatorial scheme of values, see above, Ch.6.a at n.10. On his "refusal" of honours, see above n.2 and also below, n.44.

17. On the hereditary principle, Millar (1981), 34-6 (whence quote at p.34). That hereditary descent was no guarantee was shown very early on by the fates of Agrippa Postumus, Tiberius Gemellus and Claudius' only natural son Britannicus.

18. According to Roman law (including for the purposes of inheritance), an adopted son was entirely the same as a natural son. As such, adoption played a key role in imperial succession, not just in the second century (Pliny's assertion, <u>Paneg</u>. 7.1, that the idea was new is disingenuous), but from the beginning: Augustus himself; his various heirs, including Tiberius; Galus; Nero (cf. Tacitus <u>Hist</u>. 1.18.2 on Galba's abortive adoption of Piso in AD 69). These instances all point to the enormous significance of adoption in the first century. The the second-century "system" of adoption (set in train by Hadrian, who probably invented his own adoption by Trajan) was only in default of children of the blood: the stoic Marcus felt no qualms in promoting his own sons. (On the above, see Wirszubski (1950), 154-8.) Septimius aligned himself, first with Pertinax, then with the Antonine dynasty (and thus all the way back to Nerva), renaming his son M. Aurellus Antoninus. Elagabalus not only claimed to be Caracalla's natural son, but also married into the house of Marcus. On heredity (fictional or real, adoptive or by blood-descent) as fundamentally a representation of continuity, Millar (1981), 35.

19. Augustus is at pains to give the utmost stress to his military achievements throughout the <u>Res Gestae</u> (e.g. 26-7, 29-30; cf. 25, 31-3), and in particular he emphasizes the outstanding number of imperatorial acclamations he had received (<u>RG</u> 4). On <u>imperium</u> in this context, see Yavetz (1984), 9f. On the imperial monopoly from AD 22, Tacitus <u>Ann</u>. 3.74. See in more detail above Ch.3, nn. 2, 25; Ch.4.a; Ch.5, n.1; cf. below n.26. Even though Augustus was shaken by the disaster of Varrus and Tiberius decided to call a

halt, there was, in fact, continual pressure on the emperors to conquer and extend the empire, see Mann, J.C. (1979). Smith (1988), 38, states: "Military victory was one of the prime requisites for Hellenistic kingship in both theory and practice; without heredity it was essential." Very much the same is true of the Roman empire.

20. In fact, Eutropius' formula for Claudius II, "a militibus electus a senatu appellatus Augustus" (9.11.1), applies equally to Claudius I. Vespasian's dies imperii was 1 July (the date of his military acclamation in the east, not the date of senatorial recognition, 22 December); Hadrian took 11 August and Septimius 9 April (in both cases dates considerably anterior to the dates of their recognition by the senate). Furthermore Macrinus and Elagabalus retained their military dies imperii, while Caracalla's date is given in the Feriale Duranum (1.17-18) as 4 February, the date of the troops reaffirmation of loyalty to him on Septimius' death in York, but in his lifetime he infact used 28 January (the date of his military acclamation in the east when Septimius elevated him); neither date has anything to do with senatorial decrees. (On the Feriale Duranum in this context, see Fink, et al. (1940); and more generally, see Nock (1972), II 737ff.) Note also the military settings chosen by Nero: Suet. Nero 8; Tac. Ann. 12.69; Galba in his adoption of Piso: Tac. Hist. 1.17f.; Didius Julianus: Dio 73.11-12, esp 12.4; SHA Did.Jul. 2.5-3.6; Macrinus: Dio 78.16.2; Herodian 5.1; SHA, Macr. 6.5f. (to mention but a few).

21. This is already obvious, in fact, in the wording of the lex de imperio Vespasiani itself: CIL VI, 930 (ILS 244), clause 8, lines 30-33 (a convenient and telling retroactive formula in which all actions taken by the emperor up until that time are proclaimed to have been valid); cf. also the famous discretion clause (6), lines 18-22. Quote: John Harrington, Epigrams (1618), IV.5: "Of Treason".

22. Brunt (1977), 99 n.21.

23. The Res Gestae is spangled with accounts of the emperor's lavish generosity and largesse (RG 15-24, "appx." 1-4); for all that these gestures seem very concentrated on Rome, the message of the emperor's munificence was intended for the whole empire (see Yavetz (1984), passim; and for the last point cf. the review of Millar & Segal (1984) by A. Wallace-Hadrill in JRS 75 (1985), 245-50 at pp. 248-9). The Golden Shield proclaiming Augustus' "virtues" (RG 34.2) had Hellenistic precedents; the four virtues mentioned

were not in any way an exclusive canon thereafter: Wallace-Hadrill (1981). Perhaps the greatest of all Augustus' benefactions was the provision of peace and security: Tacitus' remarks (Ann. 1.2, cf. Hist. 1.1.1) may be sardonic, but they tell the truth. The symbolism of the emperor as generous provider and benefactor ~~aspect~~ continued to be central to imperial ideology: see also (on euergetism and the games) Veyne (1976), esp. 540ff., 682-701; Cameron, A. (1976), 157-92; Hopkins (1983), 1-30, esp. 12-20.

24. On adventus see MacCormack (1972), and more generally on the political ramifications of such ceremonial, MacCormack (1981); Alföldi, A. (1934), 88ff.; Millar (1977), 31ff.; Geertz (1977), passim. On the significance of the triumph and other related imperial ceremonial occasions in this context, see McCormick (1986), 3-21 (citing Josephus BJ 7.118-62); Weinstock (1971), 107, 197f., 270ff.; Versnel (1970), passim.

25. Hopkins (1978), 197-42; Price, S. (1984), 65ff., and esp. 239ff. (contrasting the somewhat simplistic approach taken by Gesche (1978) against that of Geertz); Garnsey & Saller (1987), 202. See also Price, S. (1980); Price, S. (1987); den Boer (1973).

26. For expressions of loyalty specifically connected with the army in the third century see above, Ch.4.a; cf. the modern works cited in Ch.4, n.1, Ch.5, n.1.

27. The strategic shift: Luttwak (1976), esp. 145-54; cf. Millar (1982); Millar (1981), 240f. On the separate "phases" of Roman foreign policy: Luttwak (1976), passim, notably on "Defence in Depth", pp.130-45; see, however, Mann, J.C. (1979); see now also B. Isaac, The Limits of Empire, Oxford, 1990. The prolonged, extensive and costly Marcomannic wars had required more resources than the empire could comfortably commit to one area of the frontier (Birley (1966), 323ff.) The "soft underbelly" of the empire's Mediterranean heartland (including eventually Athens and even Rome itself) came under serious threat for the first time in centuries. On the rise of Sassanid Persia, Christensen (1944), 84-98, (and on tactical shifts) 207-12; Millar (1981), 257ff. By the beginning of the seventh century the Persian armies had even penetrated to within sight of the city of Constantinople itself.

28. On the dilemma of the necessity for imperial omnipresence at this time, see Millar (1982), 11-15.

29. On the nature and evolution of co-rulership, Kornemann (1930), passim, esp. (on 2nd and 3rd

centuries, though not always reliably) 72-110. On the title "Pontifex Maximus" in this context, see above, Ch.3, n.1. Another development related to co-regency was the increasing prominence of imperial women especially from the early third century.

30. On the Licinian collegiate rule, Kornemann (1930), 102-3 (on precedents for the partition of competence more or less on geographical lines, cf. pp. 79-81, 88-90); that there was no overlap between the two sons (and thus no Licinian "tetrarchy"), see König (1981), 44-6. The promotion of younger members of the imperial family, of course, goes back to the beginning of the empire with Gaius and Lucius Caesar.

31. The sole reigns of Commodus, Caracalla and Julian are among the few exceptions. Obviously at times this point amounts to a technicality (as in the sole reign of Constantine I); but it is none the less revealing for that. The prevalence of multiple emperors confounds our (and even some ancients') notions of Roman imperial monarchy, and affords us a much better perspective on the Tetrachy than the "caesura" mentality allows for. See Millar (1982), 15f.

32. The passage from Jones (1964), 23, cited in Ch.1.b above (p.13) is a perfect example. The length of Gallienus' reign given here by Jones totally ignores the seven years during which he reigned conjointly with his father. Moreover, there can be little sense in averaging such disparate quantities as eight years (let alone fifteen) and two months. The significant factor is not so much the brevity of the reigns of many of the contenders but the high instance of usurpation and civil war during this period. Such calculations are common, even in the more sober accounts of the period: e.g. Millar (1981), 240; Price, S (1987), 98.

33. Millar (1977), 277, 619; cf. Hopkins (1983), 176-84. Emperors who embarked on protracted absences from the metropolis for reasons other than the personal conduct of some important military campaign (as Tiberius on Capri and the itinerant Hadrian) tended thus to be unpopular with the senate.

34. Whether or not the exclusion of senators from military commands was finally formalized in the form of the supposed "edict of Gallienus", (Victor Caes. 33.34; independent evidence is not forthcoming), the situation was no more than the culmination of a long-standing trend: see Pflaum (1976); cf. Hopkins (1983), 183; Cornell & Matthews (1982), 169. See above, Ch.6.a, nn. 11 and 12.

35. On the changing origins of the emperors from the first to the third centuries, see Millar (1981), 43-51. Dio's evident distaste for Macrinus stems largely, if not exclusively, from the fact that he was not of senatorial status (Dio 78.41); the same opprobrious statement is elsewhere levelled at the much-hated Maximinus (SHA Max.duo 8.1; Eutrop. 9.1; cf. Victor Caes. 25.1).

36. Herodian 1.6.5; cf. Dig. 3.2.2.4; 48.22.18 pr.; 50.1.33; cf. Millar (1977), 39: "...the emperor functioned as a sort of moving capital of the empire in himself." On the same notion already in Aristides: Sherwin-White (1973), 259 (cf. 262); cf. Kantorowicz (1957), 204ff. Note also Marcus' reference to Serdica as "my Rome" (Petrus Patr., FHG IV, 199, in Dio, ed. Boissevain, III, 748, fr. 190; cited in Millar (1977), 12). On the question of the evolution of regional imperial "capitals", see Millar (1977), 40-53.

37. On the status of these two cities as regional "capitals", see: (Antioch) Millar (1977), 48-50 (esp. 49f. and nn.98-9 for Valerian at Antioch); Downey (1961), 259; and (Trier) Millar (1977), 45-6 (underestimating its status prior to the beginning of the 4th century); Wightman (1970), 54, notes that the presence of a praetorian camp in the city under Postumus "suggests that the court was sometimes in residence at Trier", and, p.58, acknowledges the importance of the western emperors' contribution to the future development of Trier as an imperial capital, but does not fully appreciate its significance as such in the third century.

38. On the need for symbolic incorporation, see above Ch.6.c and n.55. On the imperial cult (and other aspects of imperial rule) as a focus for integration and incorporation: Price, S. (1984), passim, esp. 146-62, 172-88, 234-48; Sherwin-White (1973), 221ff. (esp. 223), 402-37; Nock (1972), I 202-51. On symbolic conflation of ruler and state, Kantorowicz (1957), passim; cf. Hobsbawm (1983b), 266; Geertz (1977); Veyne (1976), 540-41. Note esp. in this respect the joint cult of Roma and Augustus: see above Ch.4.c (and it is worth remembering that the monumentum Ancyranum was part of this cult). The convergence of Hellenism and Romanity formed a "new Romanity", which transcended the pagan/Christian "boundary" (Eusebius and Themistius, for example, were equally at home with this ideology) and which was decisive for the future of the Roman empire (in different ways in east and west): see Dagron (1968), passim, esp. 203.

39. Whatever arcane motives Caracalla may or may not have had, it is possible to see more clearly than contemporaries were able to that his general enfranchizement formed a significant and inevitable step in a much larger process of realignment that had been going on for centuries and was to continue for centuries to come. It was a process, in which the acceptance of Christianity in the edict of Milan formed another significant step, that eventually allowed "Rome" the metaphor to outlive "Rome" as a political entity. See Kantorowicz (1957), 82f., 246f. On the background to the constitutio Antoniniana and the shifting meaning of the concept "Roman" in this context, see Sherwin-White (1973), 221ff.; Wallace-Hadrill (1982b), 48; Garnsey & Saller (1987), 115. For the later stages of these developments, see Dagron (1968), 83-119.

40. As Aristides gratefully acknowledged, the Hellenized east did very well out of the Roman empire, not least because there was already in place in the east a sophisticated mechanism for diplomatic intercourse between local communities and distant monarchical rulers. See Millar (1977), 375-447; Hopkins (1983), 184-200; Garnsey & Saller (1987), 123-4; Sherwin-White (1973), 260f., 402-7 (enthusiasm for Roman imperial rule in E. more than just gratitude for peace). The shift of gravity to the east was not merely political, but economic and strategic as well (on strategic shift, see above, n.27; on Constantinople as part of this shift, below n.54).

41. This theme has been explored by Dagron (1968), 121-46. In the west during the fourth century this entailed a plaintive and introspective outcry from the senatorial aristocracy against the diminution of their privilages, prestige and power which seriously affected the historical and political perspective of those who wrote at this time. See Dagron (1968), 202f.; cf. J.F. Matthews, Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425, Oxford, 1975.

42. The legal transfer of sovereign power from the people to the emperor: Dio 53.17.1; CJ 1.17.1.7; Ulpian, Digest 1.4.1.pr. (where this is cited as proof that the emperor's will is law; cf. Dio Chrysostum Or. III.43). This was neither more nor less "fictitious" than the parallel notion of senatorial endorsement: edict could stand for SC as easily as the latter could stand for lex: see Millar (1977), 616; Wallace-Hadrill (1982b), 37-8; cf. also above, n.7.

43. Suet. Aug. 53.1; Dio 55.12.2; cf. Tertul. Apol. 34.1. Tiberius also: Suet. Tib. 27; Tacitus Ann. 2.87; Dio

57.8.1; Victor Caes 11.2. These statements make it quite clear that, for all that these emperors refused the title dominus, many continued to think it fit (or wise) to use it: see below, n.45. Note also, in the same vein, Augustus' decision against the title "Romulus" as being too regal (Suet. Aug. 7.2; Dio 53.16.7-8); cf. Ovid Fast. 2.142, where Romulus is linked to dominus and both are contrasted with "Augustus" (cf. below n.51).

44. For imperial recusatio: Béranger (1953), 137-69 ("le refus du pouvoir".); Wallace-Hadrill (1982b), 36-7 (and cf. above, nn. 2, 3). His deference to his fellow senators, his refusal to accept the hyperbolic honours they urged upon him and his care to avoid being represented merely as a Hellenistic, or Roman, king served to underline the extent to which his authority already surpassed that of both the senate and mere kings. This impression was further reinforced by the fact that kings came to receive their diadems from the emperor's hands.

45. Domitian: Suet. Dom. 13; see also Dio 67.4.7 (cf. 67.13.4); Pliny Pan. 45.3; 55.6f.; Victor Caes. 11.2. Caligula too: Philo leg. ad Gai. 17; Victor Ceas. 3.13; Epit. 3.8; cf. Suet. Calig. 22.1. In fact, however, this image of Domitian (and Caligula) as aberrant in this regard is almost certainly a myth: it was evidently not the title dominus but his style of dominatio that made Domitian unpopular with the senatorial class. The title was applied in the east to emperors from the first century and became common currency in the second (even being used by Pliny himself in addressing Trajan: Pliny Ep. 10, passim). On the common use of the title dominus (kurios), see Neumann (1903), 1307-9; Alföldi (1935), 91-4; Béranger (1953), 61ff. (cf. above, Ch.3.a). Augustan recusatio applied to divine honours too, but here again we can be sure (with much stronger evidence) that such honours were constantly paid and, outside Rome, actively if at first modestly encouraged. For Aurelian's title, see above Ch.3.b.

46. For this reason our own detailed historical insights into the policies of Augustus sometimes act as a hindrance to our understanding of subsequent developments in imperial ideology and the relationship these bear to the Augustan paradigm. The Hellenistic, and indeed the Roman, imitatio Alexandri must be understood to function in the same way. On symbols and context, above 6.c.

47. The glorification of Augustus' victories at Rome in such a way as specifically to link them to the

emperor's divine allies surpassed that of any subsequent emperor: see Zanker (1988), 183-92; cf. below, nn. 48-51. The arguments of Storch (1972) and others, viewing a belief in miraculous victory as a symptom of absolutist monarchy, are thus unsatisfactory; see above, Ch.4.b.

48. For the alignment between imperial virtus and Mars see above Ch.4.b. The temple of Mars Ultor had originally been vowed in revenge of Julius Caesar, but by the time of its final dedication it had come to symbolize the culmination of Rome's destiny in the virtus of Augustus, Crassus' avenger and humbler of Parthia: on the symbolism of the forum of Augustus see below, n.51.

49. On the Palatine temple, constructed adjacent to Augustus' grand private/public house (another aspect of the ambiguity), see Zanker (1988), 50-51; cf. also Ch.1, n.23 (and see also the Gallienic reference, above, Ch.4 n.86). On the solarium, in the form of a horologium the dial of which was designed to point directly to the Ara Pacis on his birthday, see Zanker (1988), 144. For solar theology as a constant theme of imperial ideology note, e.g. Seneca Apoc. 4; Pan.Lat. 3.9.2-3 (cf. Apollo, 7.21.4-6); Euseblus de laud. Const. 3; Vita Const. I.43; Themistius Or IV.51.c-52.a; Corippus In laud. Iust. II.90-97, 148-51; for third-century examples see above Ch.4.d; and generally Kantorowicz (1963).

50. The notion of the emperor as saviour was there from the beginning: Propertius (IV.6, ll.45 ff.) referred to the victor of Actium as "Salvator mundi"; the Hellenistic royal title Σωτήρ appears early on for emperors in the east (e.g. postumously for Augustus, SEG xi.923; for Vespasian in AD 69, P.Fouad 8); see Weinstock (1971), 142f.; Dvornik (1966), II 478, 488ff.; cf. above Ch.3 n.42. Augustus was honoured ob cives servatos and was granted the corona civica for having saved the lives of the entire citizenry (RG 34.2; Dio 53.16.4; see Zanker (1988), 93-4, and fig. 76a). As Cicero makes clear (pro Rab. perd. 27; ad fam. 1.9.1.) any man whose life (or reputation) is saved in such a manner is thereby beholden to his saviour as to a father. Indeed, in 2 BC, Augustus officially became styled pater patriae, a title which lay at the very centre of Augustan ideology (RG 35; Dio 53.18.3; cf. (from 29 BC!) Horace Od. I.2.45ff.). On its centrality, its significance and its precedents, see Yavetz (1984), 13-14; von Premerstein (1937), 166-75; Berlinger (1935), 77-80; Weinstock (1971), 200-204, 250ff.; Dvornik (1966), II 489f., 494f., 502f., 538ff.; see also Seneca de clem. 1.14

(cf. Altman (1938), 203). A central feature of this "salvation" ideology was the emperor's provision of peace (an emphasis new to Augustus and not drawn from Hellenistic kingship): note the emphasis on the temple of Janus and the Ara Pacis Augustae (RG 12.2-13; see Zanker (1988), 104, 172ff.; Syme (1960), 519f., stressing link between the ideas of pater and pacifer). For third-century continuation of these themes, see above Ch.3.a-3.c; Ch4.c.

51. In the imagery of the Forum of Augustus and the temple precinct of Mars Ultor (as also to a lesser extent in the Ara Pacis) Augustus was symbolically represented as the "new Aeneas", the "new Romulus", the crowning glory of the destiny of both Rome and the gens Iulia: Zanker (1988), 192-215; Gagé (1930). Although Augustus rejected the title "Romulus" (above, n.43), Suetonius, Aug. 7.2., citing Ennius, draws attention to the relationship between Rome and the title "Augustus". The title pater patriae also played a central role in this symbolism, prominently displayed under the quadriga in the centre of the forum. On the reign of Augustus as a new "Golden Age" see Zanker (1988), 167-192; Wallace-Hadrill (1982a), passim. For the perpetuation of these themes see Zanker (1988), 215-38. On the survival of these themes in the third century see above Ch.4.c.

52. Augustus was proud of his achievements as a second founder, justly claiming to have turned a city of brick into a city of marble (Suet. Aug. 28f.; cf. RG 19-21.2, "appx." 2-3.). For his representation as a founder in the metaphorical sense, see above, nn. 50-51. For Rome as "Colonia Commodiana" (forming part of a grand scheme of renaming that extended even to the month of the year): Dio, 72.15.2; SHA, Comm. 8.6. This was at least in part a reflection of the Hellenistic royal style of naming cities (re-)founded by kings (in imitation of Alexander), a style of symbolic representaion which continued throughout the imperial period (Hadrianople and Constantinople being only the most famous examples; see below, nn. 54, 55).

53. Coins minted by C. Lentulus for Augustus in 12 BC depict the emperor raising the kneeling res publica (Zanker (1988), 91f. and fig.74.). For the Augustan image of restitutor orbis, see above n.50.

54. On Constantinople as "the culmination of a long process", Millar (1977), 53; on the association between emperor and state: see above, Ch.4.c, esp. 142-4 (cf. App. table A:13) on the western emperors and Roma; cf. Ch.5 n.8.

55. Price, S. (1984), esp. 239-48; see also Millar (1977), 611-20; Dvornik (1966), II 472-600; Weinstock (1971); Alföldi, A. (1934) and Alföldi, A. (1935); cf. Wallace-Hadrill (1982b).

56. Note, e.g., the use of the titles Our Lord and Saviour, and the strong association with Sol/Hellos (for Eusebius' analogy between Constantine and Christ as the solar charioteer see above, n.49). See Dvornik (1966), II 614ff.; cf. above, nn. 45, 49, 50, 52, 54. The posthumous image of Divus Augustus included, for example, the use of the radiate crown, employed for the first time by a living emperor under Nero (above, Ch.3 n.91).

57. Many of the works referred to in the notes for this chapter have achieved this re-evaluation of Augustus: in particular see those works listed in Ch.1, n.23, and in addition, Wallace-Hadrill (1982a) and (1982b).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldi, A. (1927): A. Alföldi, "Zur Kenntnis der Zeit der römischen Soldatenkaiser. I. Der Usurpator Aureolus und die Kavallereireform des Gallienus", ZfN, 1927, 197-212 [= Alföldi, A. (1967), 1-15].

Alföldi, A. (1928): id., "Zur Kenntnis der Zeit der römischen Soldatenkaiser. II. Das Problem des 'verweiblichten' Kaisers Gallienus", ZfN, 1928, 156-203 [= Alföldi, A. (1967), 16-56].

Alföldi, A. (1929): id., "The numberings of the victories of the Emperor Gallienus and of the loyalty of his legions", NC, 1929, 218-279 [cf. Alföldi, A. (1967), 73-119].

Alföldi, A. (1930): id., "Zur Kenntnis der Zeit der römischen Soldatenkaiser. III. Die Besiegung eines Gegenkaisers im Jahre 263", ZfN 1930, 1-15 [= Alföldi, A. (1967), 57-72].

Alföldi, A. (1931): id., "Siscia. Vorarbeiten zu einem Corpus der Siscia geprägten Römermünzen, I: die Prägungen des Gallienus", NK 26-7, 1927-8 (1931), 14-48.

Alföldi, A. (1934): id., "Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniels am römischen Kaiserhofe", RM 49 (1934), 1-118.

Alföldi, A. (1935): id., "Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser", RM 50 (1935), 1-171.

Alföldi, A. (1937): id., "Die Hauptereignisse der Jahre 253-61 n Chr. im Orient im Spiegel der Münzprägungen", Berytus 4 (1937), 41-68 [= Alföldi, A. (1967), 123-54].

Alföldi, A. (1938): id., "Die römische Münzprägung und die historischen Ereignisse im Osten zwischen 260 und 270 n. Chr.", Berytus 5 (1938), 47-92 [= Alföldi, A. (1967), 155-209].

Alföldi, A. (1939): id., "The Crisis of the Empire AD 249-270", in CAH XII, Cambridge, 1939, 165-192 [cf. Alfoldi, A. (1967), 342-74].

Alföldi, A. (1940): id., "The reckoning of the regnal years and victories of Valerian and Gallienus", JRS 30 (1940), 1-10 [cf. Alföldi, A. (1967), 210-227].

Alföldi, A. (1967): Id., Studien zur Geschichte der Weltkrise des 3. Jahrhunderts nach Christus, Darmstadt, 1967.

Alföldi, M.R. (1957): M.R. Alföldi, "Zu den Militärreformen des Kaisers Gallienus", Limes Studien 3, Basel (1957), 13-18.

Alföldy (1974): G. Alföldi, "The Crisis of the Third Century as seen by Contemporaries", GRBS 15 (1974), 89-111.

Altman (1938): M. Altman, "Ruler-Cult in Seneca", C.Ph. 33 (1938), 198-204.

Amit (1965): M. Amit, "Propagande de succès et d'euphorie dans l'Empire romain", Iura 16 (1965), 52-75.

Andreae (1977): B. Andreae, The Art of Rome, New York, 1977.

Andreotti (1940): "Il culto dello Hercules Magusano e dello Hercules Deusoniensis nella politica dell'usurpatore Postumo", Studi di antichita classica offerti...a E. Ciaceri, Naples, 1940, 1-12.

Arendt (1970): H. Arendt, On Violence, New York, 1970.

Armstrong (1987): D. Armstrong, "Tribunician Dates of the Joint and Separate Reigns of Valerian and Gallienus: a Plea for the August-September Theory", ZPE 67 (1987), 215-23.

Avery (1940): W.T. Avery, "The Adoratio Purpuriae and the Importance of the Imperial Purple in the Fourth Century of the Christian Era", MAAR 17 (1940), 66-80.

Barbieri (1952): G. Barbieri, L'albo senatorio da Severo a Carino (193-285), Rome, 1952.

Barnes (1982): T.D. Barnes, The New Empire of Diocletian and Contantine, Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

Bastien (1958): P. Bastien, "Les travaux d'Hercule dans le monnayage de Postume", RN, 1958, 59-78.

Bastien (1967): Id., Le monnayage bronze de Postume, Numismatique Romaine III, Wetteren, 1967.

Bastien (1976): Id., Le monnayage de l'atelier de Lyon: de la réouverture de l'atelier par Aurélian à la mort de Carin (fin 274 - mi 285), Numismatique Romaine IX, Wetteren, 1976.

Bastien (1980): Id., "Egide, Gorgoneion et buste Impérial dans le monnayage Romain", NAC 9 (1980), 247-83.

Bastien (1981): Id., "Clipeus et buste monétaire des empereurs Romains", NAC 10 (1981), 315-52.

Bastien (1984): Id., "L'atelier de Milan en 268", La Zecca di Milano, Atti Conv. Int. di stud. Milano 1983, Milan (1984), 133-45.

Bastien & Arnold-Blucchi (1983): P. Bastien and C. Anrnold-Blucchi, "Busto Monetale come Mercurio (Gallieno, Aureliano)", Rivista Italiana di Num. e Scienze Affini 84 (1983), 73-85.

Bastien & Huvelin (1969): P. Bastien and H. Huvelin, "Trésor d'antoniniani en Syrie", RN, 1969, 231-70.

Bastien & Pflaum (1961): P. Bastien and H.-G. Pflaum, "La trouvaille de monnaies romaines de Thibouville (Eure)", (I) Gallia 19 (1961), 71-101.

Bastien & Pflaum (1962): P. Bastien and H.-G. Pflaum, "La trouvaille de monnaies romaines de Thibouville (Eure)", (II) Gallia 20 (1962), 255-315.

Bayles (1976): M.D. Bayles, "The Function and Limit of Political Authority" in Harris (1976), 101-11.

Beard & Crawford (1985): M. Beard and M.H. Crawford, Rome in the Late Republic, London, 1985.

Bell (1975): D.V.J. Bell, Power, Influence and Authority, New York (1975).

Belloni (1974): G.G. Belloni, "Significati storico-politici delle figurazioni e delle scritte delle monete da Augusto a Traiano", ANRW II.1, Berlin (1974), 997-1144.

Béranger (1953): J. Béranger, Recherches sur l'aspect ideologique du Principat, Basel, 1953.

Berenson (1954): B. Berenson, The Arch of Constantine; or, The Decline of Form, New York, 1954.

Berlinger (1935): L. Berlinger, Beiträge zur inoffiziellen Titulatur der römischen Kaiser, Breslau (1935).

Bernareggi (1974): E. Bernareggi, "Familia Monetalis", NAC 3 (1974), 177-91.

Besly (1984): E.M. Besly, "The Gold Coinage of the Gallic Empire", NC 1984, 228-33 [review of Schulte (1983)].

Besly & Bland (1983): E.M. Besly and R.F. Bland, The Cunetio Treasure. Roman Coinage of the Third Century AD, London, 1983.

Besnier (1937): M. Besnier, L'Empire romain de l'avenèment des Sévères au concile de Nicée, Paris, 1937.

Birley (1966): A. Birley, Marcus Aurelius, London, 1966.

Birley (1988): Id., The African Emperor: Septimius Severus, [2nd ed.] London, 1988.

Bivona (1966): L. Bivona, "Per la Cronologia di Aureliano," Epigraphica 28 (1966), 106-121.

Bland (1979): R.F. Bland, "The 1973 Beachy Head Treasure Trove of third-century Antoniniani", NC 1979, 61-107.

Bland (1982): Id., The Blackmoor Hoard, [CHRB III] London, 1982.

Bland (1988a): Id., "Stevenage, Hertfordshire", in R.F. Bland and A. Burnett (edd.), The Normanby Hoard and Other Roman Coin Hoards, [CHRB VIII] London, 1988, 43-73.

Bland (1988b): Id., [review of Drinkwater (1987), Schulte (1983), etc.] JRS 78 (1988), 258-61.

Bland & Burnett (1988): R.F. Bland and A. Burnett, "The Normanby Hoard", in Id. (edd.), The Normanby Hoard and Other Roman Coin Hoards, [CHRB VIII] London, 1988, 114-215.

Bleicken (1981): J. Bleiken, Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte des romischen Kaiserreiches, [2nd ed.] 2 vols, Paderborn, 1981.

de Blois (1976): L. de Blois, The Policy of the Emperor Gallienus, Leiden, 1976.

Boatswain (1988): T. Boatswain, "Images of Uncertainty: some thoughts on the meaning of form in the art of Late Antiquity", BMGS 12 (1988), 27-45.

den Boer (1973): W. den Boer (ed.), Le Culte des Souverains dans l'Empire Romain, [Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XIX] Geneva, 1973.

Bolin (1932): S. Bolin, "Die Chronologie der gallischen Kaiser", Bull. de la Societe Royale des Lettres de Lund 5, 1931/32 (1932), 93-154.

Bolin (1958): Id., State and Currency in the Roman Empire to 300 AD, Stockholm, 1958.

Bourdieu (1977): P. Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice, Cambridge, 1977.

Brenot & Pflaum (1965): C. Brenot and H.-G. Pflaum, "Les émissions orientales de la fin du IIIe siècle après J.-C. à la lumière de deux trésors découverts en Syrie", RN, 1965, 134-205.

Brilliant (1963): R. Brilliant, Gesture and Rank in Roman Art, New Haven, 1963.

Brown (1978): P. Brown, The Making of Late Antiquity, Cambridge Mass. and London, 1978.

Brunt (1977): P.A. Brunt, "Lex de Imperio Vespasiani", JRS 67 (1977), 95-116.

Brunt & Moore (1973): P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore, Res Gestae Divi Augusti, [revised ed.] Oxford, 1973.

Bull (1977): H. Bull, The Anarchical Society, London, 1977.

Bureth (1964): P. Bureth, Les titulatures impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptions d'Egypte (30 a.c.- 284 p.c.), Brussels, 1964.

Burgess (1988): R. Burgess, "Quinquennial Vota and Imperial Consulship, 337-511", NC 148 (1988), 77-96.

Butcher (1988): K. Butcher, Roman Provincial Coins: An Introduction to the "Greek Imperials", London, 1988.

Buttrey (1972): T.V. Buttrey, "Vespasian as Moneyer," NC (1972), 89-109.

Callu (1969): J.P. Callu, La politique monétaire des empereurs romains de 238 à 311, Paris, 1969.

Cameron, A. (1976): A. Cameron, Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium, Oxford, 1976.

Cameron, A.M. (1976): Averil M. Cameron, Flavius Cresconius Corippus, In Laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris London, 1976.

Cameron, A.M. (1987): id., "The construction of court ritual: the Byzantine Book of Ceremonies", in Cannadine & Price (1987), 106-136.

Campbell (1984): J.B. Campbell, The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 BC-AD 235, Oxford, 1984.

Cannadine (1983): D. Cannadine, "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition' c. 1820-1977", in Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), 101-64.

Cannadine & Price (1987): D. Cannadine and S.R.F. Price (edd.), Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies, Cambridge, 1987.

Carson (1957): R.A.G. Carson, "Internuntius Deorum: a new type for Postumus and its place in the series", Congr. int. de num., Paris 1953, II: Actes, Paris, 1957, 259-71.

Carson (1961): Id., "Hollingbourne treasure trove," NC, 1961, 211-223.

Carson (1965): Id., "The Reform of Aurelian", RN, 1965, 225-35.

Carson (1968): Id., "The Hâma hoard and the eastern mints of Valerian and Gallienus," Berytus 17 (1968), 123-42.

Carson (1978): Id., "Mints in the mid-third century" in R.A.G. Carson and C.M. Kraay (eds), Scripta Numeria Romana, London (1978), 65-74.

Carson (1980): Id., Principal Coins of the Romans, II The Principate 31 BC-AD 296, London, 1980.

Carson (1982): Id., "The date of the capture of Valerian I", Actes du 9e congrès int. de num., Berne, 1979, I: Numismatique antique, Luxemburg (1982), 461-5.

Carson (1983): Id., "Coin Hoards and Roman Coinage of the Third Century AD", in C.N.L. Brooke et al. (edd.), Studies in Numismatic Method presented to P. Grierson, Cambridge (1983), 65-74.

Carson (1990): Id., Coins of the Roman Empire, London, 1990.

Casey (1986): J.P. Casey, Understanding Ancient Coins: An Introduction for Archaeologists and Historians, London, 1986.

Cesono (1949-51): S.L. Cesono, "Salonina Augusta in Pace", RPAA 25-6 (1949-51), 105-21.

Charlesworth (1937): M.P. Charlesworth, "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief", Proc.B.A., 23 (1937), 105-30.

Chastagnol (1980): A. Chastagnol, "Sur la chronologie des années 275-285", in P. Bastien et al. (edd.), Mélanges de numismatique d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Jean Lafaurie, Paris (1980), 75-82.

Christensen (1944): A. Christensen, L'Iran sous les Sassanides, [2nd ed.] Copenhagen, 1944.

Christol (1975): M. Christol, "Les règnes de Valérien et de Gallien (253-268): travaux d'ensemble, questions chronologiques," ANRW II.2, Berlin (1975), 803-27.

Cohen (1885-8): H. Cohen, Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain, V-VII, Paris, 1885-88.

*

Combet Farnoux (1981): B. Combet Farnoux, "Mercure romain, les 'Mercuriales' et l'institution du culte impérial sous le Principat augustéen", ANRW II.17.1, Berlin (1981), 457-501.

Cope (1969): L.A. Cope, "The nadir of the imperial antoninianus in the reign of Claudius II Gothicus, AD 268-70," NC, 1969, 144-61.

Cope (1974): Id., The Metallurgical Development of the Roman Imperial Coinage during the First Five Centuries AD, PhD thesis, Liverpool Polytechnic, 1974.

Cope (1977): Id., "The fitness and sequence of the Gallienic antoniniani, AD 259-68," NC, 1977, 216-19 [review of Tyler (1975)].

Cornell & Matthews (1982): T. Cornell and J.F. Matthews, Atlas of the Roman World, Oxford, 1982.

Crawford (1970): M.H. Crawford, "Money and Exchange in the Roman World", JRS 60 (1970), 40-48.

Crawford (1975): Id., "Finance, Coinage and Money from the Severans to Constantine", ANRW II.2, Berlin, 1975, 560-93.

Crawford (1983a): Id., "Roman imperial coin types and the formation of public opinion," in C.N.L. Brooke et al. (edd.), Studies in Numismatic Method presented to P. Grierson, Cambridge, 1983, 47-64.

Crawford (1983b): Id. (ed.), Sources for Ancient History, Cambridge, 1983.

Dagron (1968): G. Dagron, L'Empire romain d'Orient au IVe siècle et les Traditions politiques de l'Hellénisme, le Témoinage de Thémistios, [Travaux et Memoires, 3] Paris, 1968.

Davies (1968): R.W. Davies, "A Note on Loricitis", BJ 168 (1968), 161-5.

Deininger (1970): J. Deininger, "CIL VIII 9040 - Eine Inschrift der Provinz Mauretania Caesariensis für Aurelian", Hermes 98 (1970), 121-4.

* Cohn (1983): B. S. Cohn, "Representing Authority in Victorian India", in Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), 165-210.

Delbrueck (1940): R. Delbrueck, Die Münzbildnisse der römischen Kaiser von Maximinus bis Carinus, [Das römische Herrscherbild III.2] Berlin, 1940.

Derichs (1950): W. Derichs, Herakles. Vorbild des Herrschers in der Antike, Phil. diss., Cologne, 1950.

Dolley & O'Donovan (1962): R.H.M. Dolley and M.A. O'Donovan, "The 1961 Beachy Head (Bullock Down) hoard of third-century coins of the Central and Gallic Empires", NC, 1962, 163-88.

Downey (1950): G. Downey, "Aurelian's Victory over Zenobia at Immae, AD 272", TAPA 81 (1950), 57-68.

Downey (1961): Id., A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest, Princeton, 1961.

Doyen (1984): J.-M. Doyen, "Impérialisme et iconographie impériale: une approche sémiologique de l'atelier monétaire de Milan (257-274)", La Zecca di Milano, Atti Conv. int. di stud. Milano 1983, Milan (1984), 159-72.

Doyen (1987): Id., "La création des types iconographiques romains tardifs à propos d'une émission exceptionelle frappée a Milan en honneur de Gallien", in H. Huvelin et al. (edd.), Mélanges de Numismatiques offerts a Pierre Bastien, Wetteren (1987), 85-103.

Drinkwater (1973): J.F. Drinkwater, A History of the Gallic Empire of the Third Century AD, 2 vols, Phil. diss., Oxford, 1973.

Drinkwater (1974): Id., "Coin-hoards and the chronology of the Gallic Empire", Britannia 5 (1974), 293-302.

Drinkwater (1983): Id., [review of Konig (1981)] Gnomon 55 (1983), 468-70.

Drinkwater (1987): Id., The Gallic Empire. Separatism and Continuity in the North-Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, AD 260-274 [Historia Einzelschriften 52], Stuttgart, 1987.

Dvornik (1966): F. Dvornik, Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy, 2 vols, Washington, 1966.

Eadie (1980): J.W. Eadie, "Barbarian Invasions and Frontier Politics in the Reign of Gallienus", in W.S. Hanson and L.J.F. Keppie (edd.), Roman Frontier Studies 1979, [BAR I.S. 71], Oxford, 1980, 1045-50.

Easton (1958): D. Easton, "The Perception of Authority and Political Change", in C.J. Friedrich (ed.) Authority [NOMOS I], Cambridge, Mass., 1958, 170-96.

Elsenstadt (1968): S.N. Elsenstadt, "Introduction" in M. Weber (ed. Elsenstadt), On Charisma and Institution Building, London (1968).

Elks (1972): K.J.J. Elks, "Reattribution of the Milan coins of Trajan Decius to the Rome mint", NC (1972), 111-15.

Elks (1975): Id., "The eastern mints of Valerian and Gallienus: the evidence of two hoards from western Turkey," NC 1975, 91-109.

Elmer (1941): G. Elmer, "Die Münzprägung der gallischen Kaiser in Köln, Trier und Mailand," BJ 146 (1941), 1-106.

Ensslin (1939): W. Ensslin, "The End of the Principate", in CAH X, Cambridge, 1939, 352-82.

Ensslin (1942): Id., "Zur Torqueskronung und Schilderhebung bei der Kaiserwahl", Klio 35 (1942), 268-98.

Ensslin (1943): Id., Gottkaiser und Kaiser von Gottes Gnaden, Munich, 1943.

Estiot (1983): S. Estiot, "La trésor de Maravelle", Trésors Monetaires 5 (1983), 9-115.

Estiot (1991): Id., "Or et billon: l'atelier de Milan sous Aurelien (270-274)", in Ermano A. Arslan Studia Dicata, II: Monetazione romana repubblicana ed imperiale [Glaux. Collona di Studi Ricerche di Numismatica 7], Milan (1991), 449-93.

Fears (1977): J.R. Fears, Princeps a dis electus. The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome, Rome, 1977.

Fears (1978): Id., "Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ Ο ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ GENIUS POPULI ROMANI. A note on the origin of Dea Roma", Mnemosyne 31 (1978), [[274-...]]

Fears (1981): Id., "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems", ANRW II.17.2, Berlin (1981), 736-826.

Fink et al. (1940): R.O. Fink, A.S. Hoey and W.F. Snyder, "The Feriale Duranum" YCS 7 (1940), 1-222.

Fitz (1966a): J. Fitz, Ingenuus et Régalien, [Collection Latomus 81] Brussels, 1966.

Fitz (1966b): Id., "Les antoniniani des légions de Gallienus," Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts à Jérôme Carcopino, Paris, 1966, 353-65.

Fitz (1978): Id., Der Geldumlauf der römischen Provinzen im Donaugebiet, Mitte des 3. Jahrhunderts, Budapest & Bonn, 1978.

Fitz (1983), Id., Honorific titles of Roman Military Units in the Third Century AD, Budapset and Bonn, 1983.

Fitz (1984): Id., "Siscia-Problémák," NK 80-81, 1981-82 (1984), 27-56.

Foucault (1980): M. Foucault (ed, and trans. C. Gordon) Power/Knowledge, Brighton, 1980.

Foucault (1982): Id., "Afterword: Subject and Power", in H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, Brighton, 1982, 208-26.

Foucault (1984): Id. (trans. R. Huxley) The History of Sexuality, An Introduction, [pbk.] London, 1984.

Friedrich (1958) C.J. Friedrich, "Authority, Reason and Discretion", in C.J. Friedrich (ed.) Authority, [NOMOS I], Cambridge, Mass. (1958), 28-48.

Friedrich (1972): Id., Tradition and Society, London, 1972.

Gagé (1930): J. Gagé, "Romulus-Augustus", Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist. 47 (1930), 138-81.

Gagé (1933): Id., "La théologie de la victoire impériale", Rev.Hist. 171 (1933), 1-43.

Gallwey (1962): H.D. Gallwey, "A hoard of third-century antoninlani from southern Spain," NC, 1962, 335-406.

van Gansbeke (1955): P. van Gansbeke, "La mise en état de la défense de la Gaule au millieu du IIIe siècle après J.-C." Latomus 14 (1955), 404-25.

van Gansbeke (1959): Id., "Postume et Léllen, gouverneurs de la Germanie Inférlere?" RBN (1959), 25-32.

Garnsey & Saller (1987): P. Garnsey and R. Saller, The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture, London, 1987.

Geertz (1975): C. Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, London, 1975.

Geertz (1977): Id., "Centers, Kings and Charisma: Reflections on the Symbolics of Power", In J. Ben-David and T.N. Clark (edd.), Culture and its Creators. Essays in honor of Edward Shils, Chicago (1977), 150-71.

Gesche (1978): H. Gesche, "Die Divinisierung der römischen Kaiser in ihrer Funktion als Herrschaftslegitimation", Chiron 8 (1978), 377-90.

Gibbon (1909-14): E. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, (ed. J.B. Bury) 7 vols, London, 1909-14.

Giddens (1976): A. Giddens, New Rules of Sociological Method, London, 1976.

Giddens (1979): Id., Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis, London, 1979.

Gilljam (1982): H.H. Gilljam, Antoniniani und Aurei des Ulpius Cornelius Laelianus, Gegenkaiser des Postumus, Cologne, 1982.

Gilljam (1986): Id., 269 Laelianus: Ergänzungen zur Materialsammlung; Verwendung seiner Reversstempel unter Marius, Cologne, 1986.

Gilljam (1987): Id., "Antoniniane des Salonius Augustus", Mitt. der Österr. num. Gesellsch. 27,6 (1987), 77-83.

Gnecchi (1912): F. Gnecchi I Medaglioni Romani, 3 vols, Milan (1912).

Göbl (1951): R. Göbl, "Der Aufbau der römischen Münzprägung in der Kaiserzeit. V/1 Valerianus und Gallienus (253-260)," NZ 74 (1951), 8-45.

Göbl (1953): Id. "Der Aufbau der römischen Münzprägung in der Kaiserzeit. V/2 Gallienus als Alleinherrscher," NZ 75 (1953), 5-35.

Göbl (1970): Id., Regalianus und Dryantilla, Vienna, 1970.

Göbl (1978): Id., Antike Numismatik, Munich, 1978.

Grant (1946): M. Grant, From "Imperium" to "Auctoritas", Cambridge, 1946.

Grant (1950): Id., Roman Anniversary Issues, Cambridge, 1950.

Grant (1958): Id., Roman History from Coins, Cambridge, 1958.

Grant (1968): Id., The Climax of Rome: The Final Achievements of the Ancient World, AD 161-337, London, 1968.

Grierson (1975): P. Grierson, Numismatics, Oxford, 1975.

Groag (1903): E. Groag, "Domitius (36) Aurellanus", RE, V.1, Stuttgart, 1903, 1347-1419.

Hall & Metcalf (1972): E.T. Hall and D.M. Metcalf (edd.), Methods of Chemical and Metallurgical Investigation of Ancient Coinage, London, 1972.

Halsberghe (1972): G.H. Halsberghe, The Cult of Sol Invictus, Leiden, 1972.

Halsberghe (1984): Id., "Le culte de Deus Sol Invictus à Rome au 3e siècle après J.C.", ANRW II.17.4, Berlin (1984), 2181-2201.

Hammond (1959): M. Hammond, The Antonine Monarchy, Rome, 1959.

Hannestad (1986): N. Hannestad, Roman Art and Imperial Policy, Aarhus, 1986.

Harl (1987): K.W. Harl, Civic Coins and Civic Politics in the Roman East, AD 180-275, Berkeley, 1987.

Harris (1976): R.B. Harris (ed.), Authority, a Philosophical Analysis, Univ. of Alabama, 1976.

Hartke (1951): W. Hartke, Römische Kinderkaiser, Eine Strukturanalyse römischen Denkens und Daseins, Berlin, 1951.

Hartmann (1982): F. Hartmann, Herrschewechsel und Reichskrise: Untersuchungen zu den Ursachen und Konsequenzen der Herrschewechsel im Imperium Romanum der Soldatenkaiserzeit (3.Jh.n.Chr.), Frankfort, 1982.

Hatt (1966): J.-J. Hatt, Histoire de la Gaule romaine (120 av. J.-C. - 451 ap. J.-C.). Colonisation ou Colonialisme?, [2nd ed.] Paris, 1966.

Herrmann (1965): H.-J. Herrmann, Studien über Usurpatoren und Krise im 3. Jahrhundert unserer Zeitrechnung, unter besondere Berucksichtigung ihrer Darstellung in der Historia Augusta, 2 vols., Phil. diss., Greiffswald, 1965.

Hiernard (1952): J. Hiernard, Les sources de l'histoire des empereurs gallo-romains, Phil. diss. Bordeaux, 1952.

Hobsbawm (1983a): E. Hobsbawm "Introduction: Inventing Traditions", in Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), 1-14.

Hobsbawm (1983b): Id., "Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe 1870-1914", in Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983), 263-307.

Hobsbawm & Ranger (1983): E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (edd.), The Invention of Tradition, Cambridge (1983).

Homo (1904): L.-P. Homo, Essai sur le Règne de L'Empereur Aurélien (270-275), Paris (1904).

Hopkins (1978): K. Hopkins, Conquerors and Slaves, Cambridge (1978).

Hopkins (1983): Id., Death and Renewal, Cambridge (1983).

Howgego (1985): C. Howgego, Greek Imperial Countermarks, London, 1985.

Huvelin & Bastien (1974): "Emissions de l'atelier de Rome et chronologie des règnes de Claude II, Quintille et Aurélian", BSFN (1974), 534-9.

Imhof (1957): M. Imhof, "Invictus (Beiträge aus der Thesaurusarbeit, X)", Mus.Helv. 14 (1957), 197-215.

Instinsky (1942): H.U. Instinsky, "Kaiser und Ewigkeit", Hermes 77 (1942), 313-355.

Jenkins (1976): I. Jenkins, "Authority: Its Nature and Locus" in Harris (1976), 25-44.

Jones (1956): A.H.M. Jones, "Numismatics and history," in R.A.G. Carson and C.H.V. Sutherland (edd.) Essays in Roman Coinage presented to H. Mattingly, Oxford (1956), 13-33.

Jones (1964): Id., The Later Roman Empire, AD 284-602, Oxford, 1964, 3 vols.

Jones (1974): Id., "Inflation under the Roman Empire", in Id. (ed. P.A. Brunt) The Roman Economy, Oxford, 1974, 187-227.

de Jouvenel (1952): B. de Jouvenel, Power: Its Nature and the History of its Growth, London, 1952 (= Du Pouvoir).

de Jouvenel (1957): Id., Sovereignty: An Inquiry into the Political Good, Cambridge, 1957 (= De la Souveraineté).

de Jouvenel (1958): Id., "Authority: the Efficient Imperative", in C.J. Friedrich (ed.) Authority, [NOMOS I] Cambridge Mass., 1958, 159-69.

Jullian (1920-26): C. Jullian, Histoire de la Gaule, 7 vols, Paris 1920-26.

Kähler (1937): H. Kähler, "Zum Sonnentempel des Aurellans", RM 52 (1937), 94-105.

Kantorowicz (1957): E. Kantorowicz, The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology, Princeton, 1957.

Kantorowicz (1961): id., "Gods in Uniform", Proc.Am.Philos.Soc., 105, iv (1961), 368-93.

Kantorowicz (1963): id., "Oriens Augusti - Lever du Roi", DOP 17 (1963), 117-177.

Kellner (1978): W. Kellner, Ein römischer Münzfund aus Sirmium (Thesaurus Nummorum Romanorum et Byzantinorum, 2) Vienna, 1978.

Kent (1973): J.P.C. Kent, "Gallienae Augustae", NC (1973), 64-8.

Kettenhofen (1986): E. Kettenhofen, "Zur Siegestitulatur Kaiser Aurellans", Tyche 1 (1986), 138-46.

King, A. (1990): A. King, Roman Gaul and Germany, London, 1990.

King, C. (1982): C.E. King, "Issues from the Rome mint during the sole reign of Gallienus," Actes du 9e congrès int. de num., Berne, 1979, I: Numismatique antique, Luxembourg (1982), 467-85.

King, C. (1984): id., "The legionary antoninian of Gallienus from Milan," La Zecca di Milano, Atti Conv. int. di stud. Milano 1983, Milan (1984), 103-31.

Koestler (1967): A. Koestler, Ghost in the Machine, London, 1967.

Koestler (1983): id., Janus, A Summing Up, [pbk] London, 1983.

König (1974): I. König, "Eine Beobachtung zum Zerfall der gallischen Sonderreiches und der Titel 'Britannicus Maximus' Kaiser Aurellanus", Latomus 33 (1974), 51-6.

König (1981): id., Die Gallischen Usurpatoren von Postumus bis Tetricus [Vestigia 31], Munich, 1981.

Kornemann (1930): E. Kornemann, Doppelprinzipat und Reichsteilung im Imperium Romanum, Leipzig & Berlin, 1930.

Kramer & Jones (1943): I.F. Kramer and T.B. Jones, "'Tribunicia Potestate' A.D.270-285" AJP 64 (1943), 80-86.

Krieger (1973): L. Krieger, "Authority" in The Dictionary of the History of Ideas, [2nd ed.] New York, 1973, I 141-62.

Kuhoff (1979): W. Kuhoff Herrschertum und Reichskrise. Die Regierungszeit der römischen Kaiser Valerianus Gallienus (253-268 n. Chr.), Bochum, 1979.

Lafaurie (1964): J. Lafaurie, "La chronologie des empereurs gaulois", RN (1964), 91-127.

Lafaurie (1965): Id., "La chronologie impériale de 249 a 285", BSFN (1965), 139-154.

Lafaurie (1974): Id., "La date de la réforme monetaire d'Aurélien", BSFN (1974), 517-25.

Lafaurie (1975): Id., "L'empire Gaulois. Apport de la numismatique", ANRW II.2, Berlin (1975), 853-1012.

Laffranchi (1938): L. Laffranchi, "Le monete legionarie dell'Imperatore Gallieno e sua grande vittoria," Trans. International Numism. Congr., London, 1936, London (1938), 198-213.

Lallemand (1972): J. Lallemand, "Les premières émissions de Valérien et de Gallien à Viminacium et à Rome," Archeoloski Vestnik 23 (1972), 17-22.

Lallemand & Thirion (1970): J. Lallemand and M. Thirion, Le trésor de Saint-Mard, I: Etudes sur le monnayage de Victorin et des Tétricus, [Numismatique Romaine VI] Wetteren, 1970.

Le Gentilhomme (1943): P. Le Gentilhomme, "Le désastre d'Autun en 269", REA 45 (1943), 233-40.

Le Gentilhomme (1946): Id., "La trouvaille de Nanterre", RN (1946), 15-114.

Le Gentilhomme (1962): Id., "Variations du titre de l'antoninianus au IIIe siècle," RN, 1962, 141-66.

Levick (1982): B. Levick, "Propaganda and the Imperial coinage," Antichthon, 16 (1982), 104-16.

Lopuszanski (1951): G. Lopuszanski, La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois, Brussels, 1951.

L'Orange (1935): H. P. L'Orange, "Sol Invictus Imperator: Ein Beitrag zur Apotheose", Symb.Olso. 14,1 (1935), 86-114, [= id., Likeness and Icon. Selected Studies in Classical and Early Medieval Art, (1973) 131-157.]

L'Orange (1947): id., Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture, Oslo and London, 1947.

L'Orange (1953): id., Studies on the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World, Oslo, 1953.

L'Orange (1965): id., Art Forms and Civic Life in the Late Roman Empire, Princton, 1965.

Lukes (1974): S. Lukes, Power, A Radical View, London, 1974.

Luttwak (1976): E.N. Luttwak, The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire, from the First Century AD to the Third, Baltimore, 1976.

MacCormack (1972): S. MacCormack, "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: the Ceremony of Adventus", Historia 21 (1972), 721-52.

MacCormack (1975): id., "Roma, Constantinopolis, the Emperor amd his Genius", CQ 25 (1975), 131-50.

MacCormack (1981): id., Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity, Berkeley etc., 1981.

McCormick (1986): M. McCormick, Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West, Cambridge, 1986.

MacMullen (1963): R. MacMullen, Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire, Cambridge Mass., 1963.

MacMullen (1968): id., "Constantine and the Miraculous", GRBS 9 (1968), 81-96.

MacMullen (1976): id., The Roman Government's Response to Crisis, New Haven, 1976.

MacMullen (1988): id., Corruption and the Decline of Rome, New Haven, 1988.

Mann, J.C. (1979): J.C. Mann, "Power, Force and the Frontiers of the Empire", JRS 69 (1979), 175-83 [review of Luttwak (1976)].

Mann, M. (1986): M. Mann, The Sources of Social Power. 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760, Cambridge, 1986.

Manns (1939): F. Manns, Münzkundliche und historische Untersuchungen über die Ziet des Illyrerkaiser Aurelianus, Würzburg, 1939.

Mattingly (1939): H. Mattingly, "The Imperial Recovery", in CAH, Cambridge, 1939, 297-351.

Mattingly (1950): Id., "The Imperial Vota", PBA 36 (1950), 155-95.

Mattingly (1954): Id., "The coinage of Macrianus II and Quietus," NC, 1954, 53-61.

Mattingly (1960): Id., Roman Coins from the earliest times to the fall of the Western Empire, [2nd ed.] London, 1960.

Mellor (1981): R. Mellor, "The Goddess Roma", ANRW II.17.2, Berlin (1981), 950-1030.

Metcalf (1977): W.E. Metcalf, "The Antioch hoard of antoniniani and the eastern coinage of Trebonianus Gallus and Volusian," ANSMN 22 (1977), 71-94.

Millar (1969): F.G.B. Millar, "P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions", JRS 59 (1969), 12-29.

Millar (1971): Id., "Paul of Samosata, Zenobia and Aurelian", JRS 61 (1971), 1-17.

Millar (1977): Id., The Emperor in the Roman World, London, 1977.

Millar (1981): Id., The Roman Empire and its Neighbours, [2nd ed.] London, 1981.

Millar (1982): Id., "Emperors, Frontiers and Foreign Relations 31 B.C.-A.D. 378" Britannia 8 (1982), 1-23.

Millar (1984): Id., "State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy", in Millar & Segal (1984), 37-60.

Millar & Segal (1984): F. Millar and E. Segal (edd.), Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects, Oxford, 1984.

Milne (1933): J.G. Milne Catalogue of the Alexandrin Coins in the Ashmolean Museum, London, 1933.

Mommsen (1887-8): T. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1887-8.

Neumann (1903): K.J. Neumann, "Dominus", RE V.1 (1903), 1305-9.

Nock (1972): Id., Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, 2 vols, Oxford, 1972.

Olmstead (1942): A.T. Olmstead, "The Mid-Third Century of the Christian Era", CP 37 (1942), 241-62; 398-420.

Peachin (1983): M. Peachin, "Johannes Malalas and the Moneyers' Revolt", in C. Deroux (ed.), Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III, Brussels (1983), 325-35.

Peachin (1990): Id., Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, AD 235-284, Amsterdam, 1990.

Peters (1967): R.S. Peters, "Authority" in Quinton (1967), 83-96.

Pflaum (1957): H.-G. Pflaum, "La monnaie de Trèves à l'epoque des empereurs gallo-romains", Congr. int. num., Paris 1959, II: Actes, Paris, 1957, 273-80.

Pflaum (1976): Id., "Zur Reform des Kaisers Gallienus", Historia 25 (1976), 109-117.

Pflaum (1980): Id., "Trésor d'antoniniani de la seconde moitié du IIIe siècle trouvé en Syrie", in Mélanges de numismatiques, d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à J. Lafaurie, Paris (1980), 145-52.

Picard (1957): G.C. Picard, Les trophées romains: Contribution à l'histoire de la religion et de l'art triomphal de Rome, Paris, 1957.

Pond (1970): E.A. Pond, The Inscriptional Evidence for the Illyrian Emperors, Claudius Gothicus Through Carinus, 268-284 AD, Phil. diss., Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1970.

Pocock (1985): J.G.A. Pocock, "Gibbon's Decline and Fall and the World of the Late Enlightenment", in Id., Virtue, Commerce and History, Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge (1985), 143-56

von Premerstein (1937): A. von Premerstein, Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats, [Abt.B.A.W., N.F.15] Munich, 1937.

Price, M. (1973): M.J. Price, "The Lost Year: Greek Light on a Problem of Roman Chronology", NC, 1973, 75-86.

Price, S. (1980): S.R.F. Price, "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult", JRS 70 (1980), 28-43.

Price, S. (1984): Id., Rituals and Power, The Roman Imperial cult in Asia Minor, Cambridge, 1984.

Price, S. (1987): id., "From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman Emperors", in Cannadine & Price (1987), 56-105.

Quinton (1967): A. Quinton (ed.), Political Philosophy, Oxford (1967).

Rathbone (1986): D. Rathbone, "The dates of the recognition in Egypt of the emperors from Caracalla to Diocletian," ZPE 62 (1986), 101-31.

Rea (1972): J.R. Rea, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XL, London, 1972.

Rémondon (1964): R. Rémondon, La crise de l'empire romain de Marc-Aurèle à Anastase, Paris, 1964.

*Rohde (1881): T. Rohde, Die Münzen des Kaiser Aurelianus, seiner Frau Severina u. der Fürsten von Palmyra, Miskolc, 1881.

Robertson (1978): A. S. Robertson, Roman Imperial Coinage in the Hunter Coin Cabinet, University of Glasgow, IV: Valerian I to Allectus, Oxford (1978).

Romano (1966/7): D. Romano, "La Historia Alexandri di Giulio Valerio e l'Ideologia Politica di Aureliano", Annali del Liceo Classico 3/4 (1966/7), 218-228.

Rosenbach (1958): M. Rosenbach, Galliena Augusta, Einzelgötter und Allgott im gallienischen Pantheon, Tübingen, 1958.

Rostovtzeff (1957): M.I. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, [2nd ed., revised P.M. Fraser, 2 vols.] Oxford, 1957.

Russell (1975): B. Russell, Power, A New Social Analysis [pbk] London, 1975.

Sanders (1981): D. Sanders, Patterns of Political Instability, London, 1981.

Scarborough (1972/3): J. Scarborough, "Aurelian: Questions and Problems", CJ 68 (1972/3), 334-45.

Schtajerman (1964): E.M. Schtajerman, Die Krise der Sklavenhalterordnung im Westen des römischen Reiches, Berlin, 1964.

Schulte (1983): B. Schulte, Die Goldprägung der gallischen Kaiser von Postumus bis Tetricus, [Typos IV] Aarau, Frankfurt/M., Salzburg, 1983.

* Rieff (1979): P. Rieff, Freud: The Mind of the Moralist, [3rd ed.] Chicago, 1979.

Schulz (1919): O.T. Schulz, Vom Prinzipat zum Dominat, das Wesen des römischen Kaisertums des dritten Jahrhunderts [Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, 9/4-5], Paderborn, 1919.

Scott (1932): K. Scott, "The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship", TAPA 63 (1932) 156-65.

Sherwin-White (1973): A.N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, [2nd ed.] Oxford, 1973.

Shiel (1979): N. Shiel, "The coinage of Saloninus as Augustus," ANSMN 24, (1979), 117-22.

Shils (1965): E. Shils, "Charisma, Order and Status", Am.Sociol.Rev. 30 (1965), 199-213.

Sijpesteijn (1980): P.J. Sijpesteijn, "Remarks on some imperial titles in the papyri," ZPE 40 (1980), 130-38.

Sijpesteijn (1982a): id., "Further remarks on some imperial titles in the papyri," ZPE 45 (1982), 77-196.

Sijpesteijn (1982b): id., "More remarks on some imperial titles in the papyri," ZPE 49 (1982), 97-111.

Simon (1980): Y. Simon, A General Theory of Authority, [2nd ed.] Notre Dame, Ind., 1980.

Smith (1988): R.R.R. Smith, Hellenistic Royal Portraits, Oxford, 1988.

Sotgiu (1961), G. Sotgiu, Studi sull'Epigrafia di Aureliano, Cagliari, 1961.

Sotgiu (1975): id., "Aureliano", ANRW II.2 (1975), 1039-61.

Sperber (1975): D. Sperber (trans. A.L. Morton) Rethinking Symbolism, Cambridge, 1975.

Springer (1952): F.-K. Springer, Tyrannus: Untersuchungen zur politischen Ideologie der Romer, Phil. diss., Cologne, 1952.

Stertz (1974): S.A. Stertz, Θεία Βασιλεία, Hellenistic Theory and the Foundations of Imperial Legitimacy AD 270-395.

Storch (1972): R.H. Storch, "The 'Absolutist' Theology of Victory", Class. et Med., 29, 1968, (1972), 197-206.

Straub (1939): J. Straub, Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike, Stuttgart, 1939.

Straub (1972): Id., "Iuppiter Consul", Chiron II (1972), 545-62.

Sutherland (1951): C. H. V. Sutherland, Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, London, 1951.

Sutherland (1959): Id., "The Intelligibility of Roman Coin Types", JRS 49 (1959), 46-55.

Sutherland (1974): Id., Roman Coins, London, 1974.

Sutherland (1976): Id., The Emperor and the Coinage, Oxford, 1976.

Sutherland (1983): Id., "The purpose of Roman imperial coin types," RN, 1983, 73-82.

Sutherland (1986): Id., "Compliment or Complement? Dr. Levick on Imperial Coin Types", NC, 1986, 85-93.

Sutherland (1987): Id., Roman History and Coinage: 44 BC - AD 69, Oxford, 1987.

Syme (1960): R. Syme, The Roman Revolution, [pbk ed.] Oxford, 1960.

Syme (1968): Id., R. Syme, Ammianus and the Historia Augusta, Oxford, 1968.

Syme (1971): Id, Emperors and Biography, Oxford, 1971.

Taeger (1960): F. Taeger, Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes. II: Rom, Stuttgart, 1960.

Thirion (1973): M. Thirion, "Les émissions d'antoniniens de Victorin (269-71)", CENB (1973), 78-82.

Todorov (1983): T. Todorov (trans. C. Porter) Symbolism and Interpretation, London, 1983.

Toynbee (1944): J.M.C. Toynbee, Roman Medallions, New York, 1944.

Tyler (1975): P. Tyler, The Persian Wars of the 3rd century AD and Roman Imperial Monetary Policy, AD 253-268, [Historia Einzelschriften 23], Wiesbaden, 1975.

Versnel (1970): H.S. Versnel, Triumphus. An Enquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph, Leiden, 1970.

Veyne (1976): P. Veyne, Le pain et le cirque. sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique, Paris, 1976.

Villaronga (1987): L.Villaronga, "Notice sur un trésor du Bas-Empire provenant d'Angleterre", Mélanges de numismatique offerts à Pierre Bastien, Wetteren 1987, 117-29.

Voetter (1901/1902): O. Voetter, "Die Münzen des Kaisers Gallienus und seiner Familie, NZ 32, 1900 (1901), 117-147, and NZ 33, 1901 (1902), 73-110.

Walker (1978): D.R. Walker, The Metrology of the Roman Silver Coinage, III: Pertinax - Uranius Antoninus [BAR Suppl. Ser. 40], Oxford, 1978.

Wallace-Hadrill (1981): A. Wallace-Hadrill, "The emperor and his virtues," Historia, 30 (1981), 298-323;

Wallace-Hadrill (1982a): Id., "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology", Past and Present 95 (1982), 19-36.

Wallace-Hadrill (1982b): Id., "Civilis Princeps: between Citizen and King", JRS 72 (1982), 32-48.

Wallace-Hadrill (1983): Id., "Ut pictora poesis?" JRS 73 (1983), 180-83.

Wallace-Hadrill (1986): Id., "Image and authority in the coinage of Augustus", JRS 76 (1986), 66-87.

Watt (1982): E.D. Watt, Authority, London, 1982.

Webb (1927): P.H. Webb, Roman Imperial Coinage (edd. H. Mattingly and E.A. Syydenham), V.1., London, 1927.

Webb (1933): P.H. Webb, Roman Imperial Coinage (edd. H. Mattingly and E.A. Syydenham), V.2., London, 1933.

Weber (1968): M. Weber (ed and trans G. Roth & C. Wittich), Economy and Society, 3 vols., New York, 1968.

Weder/King (1984), M. Weder, C.E. King, "The eastern issues of Probus" NC 1984, 202-7.

Wegner (1979): M. Wegner, Das römische Herrscherbild. III.3: Gordianus III. bis Carinus, Berlin, 1979.

Weigel (1990): R.D. Weigel, "Gallienus' 'Animal Series' Coins and Roman Religion", NC 150 (1990), 135-43.

Weinstock (1957): S. Weinstock, "Victor and Invictus", H.Th.R. 50 (1957), 211-47.

Weinstock (1958a): Id., "Victor" RE VIII.A2 (1958), 2485-500.

Weinstock (1958b): Id., "Victoria" RE VIII.A2 (1958), 2501-542.

Weinstock (1971): Id., Divus Julius, Oxford, 1971.

Wickert (1926): L. Wickert, "Licinius (84) Egnatius Gallienus", RE XIII.1 (1926), 350-69.

Wickert (1954): Id., "Princeps (civitatis)", RE XXII (1954), 1998-2296.

Wightman (1970): E.M. Wightman, Roman Trier and the Treveri, London, 1970.

Wightman (1985): Id., Gallia Belgica, London, 1985.

Wightman (1986): Id., "Pagan Cults in the Province of Belgica", ANRW II.18.1, Berlin (1986), 542-89.

Will (1959): E. Will, "Un Figure du Culte Solaire d'Aurélien - Iuppiter Consul vel Consulens", Syria 36 (1959), 193-201.

Winch (1967): P. Winch, "Authority" in Quinton (1967), 97-111.

Winkler (1958): K. Winkler, "Iuppiter Consul vel Consulens (zu Hist. Aug. quad. tyr. III 4-6)", Philologus 102 (1958), 117-26.

Wirszubski (1950): C. Wirszubski, Libertas as a Political Ideal at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate, Cambridge, 1950.

de Witte (1868): J. de Witte, Recherches sur les empereurs qui ont regné dans les Gaules, Lyon, 1868.

Wood (1986): S. Wood, Roman Portrait Sculpture 217-260 AD: the Transformation of an Artistic Tradition, Leiden, 1986.

Wrong (1979): D.H. Wrong, Power: Its Forms, Bases and Uses, Oxford, 1979.

Yavetz (1984): Z. Yavetz, "The Res Gestae and Augustus' Public Image", in Millar & Segal (1984), 1-36.

Yonge (1979): D. Yonge, "The So-called Interregnum Coinage", NC (1979), 47-60.

Zanker (1988): P. Zanker, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus, Ann Arbor, MI, 1988.